

THE Catholic Mind

VOL. XLIX

FEBRUARY, 1951

NO. 1058

Discrimination in South Africa

SENATOR HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.
U. S. Delegate to the General Assembly

Statement before Committee I of the UN General Assembly on the complaint of India on discrimination against Indians by South Africa, November 17, 1950.

WE CONFRONT here in this Committee of the General Assembly of the United Nations a complaint that persons are being discriminated against because of race and color.

The American position on this question was basic to the very birth of our Republic and is completely clear today.

It is found in the Declaration of Independence which proclaims that "All men are created equal."

It is clearly expressed in our Constitution which gives us the thundering mandate "to establish justice" and which says that no *person*, regardless of whether he is a citizen,

shall be deprived of life or liberty without due process of law.

It lay at the heart of the issue for which we fought a four-year Civil War of unprecedented—and perhaps unequalled—bloodshed and suffering.

The wiping out of discrimination and the enactment of civil rights has been one of the most dynamic purposes of American society, which we have continued to pursue since the Civil War.

It is solemnly announced as a prime objective by both of our great political parties.

No one knows the race or the color of the unknown soldier who is buried in our National Cemetery at Arling-

ton. And everyone knows his sacrifice.

Of course, no nation and no people are perfect either as regards discrimination or any other social evil. Americans are not perfect. Possibly the Republic of India is not perfect insofar as discrimination is concerned. But we Americans, to use the words which Mrs. Pandit applied to her own country, "work unceasingly to end discrimination in every form." The regrettable fact that there is still some discrimination in the United States or in India certainly does not debar us from saying that we deplore discrimination, wherever it may be practiced. Our American system contains a principle of correction. In our country racial discrimination has no future. The truth is that we have hitched our wagon to a star. We have not reached the star, but we move towards it.

GREAT STRIDES MADE

This is not just a self-serving view. The people in the United States who are most closely affected—the colored people themselves—attest to the fact that while we have not gone far enough or fast enough, we have made great strides ahead. No less an authority than Mr. Roy Wilkins, Administrator of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, stated on June 20 of this year, in Boston, Massachusetts:

The people of America are responding. The tide is going our way. It is

no longer fashionable to believe in inequality, or to be unconcerned about it. There have been changes—some of them revolutionary—in great organized bodies of citizens, in scores of organizations, and in hundreds of communities. The idea has caught on. The people are moving toward equality of opportunity.

We hope that our friends in South Africa, whose sons are now fighting heroically for the United Nations in Korea, will move with us in that same direction.

I am not going into the legal and technical questions concerning whatever actual and concrete powers the United Nations may possess in a matter of this kind and will not challenge in detail the well-expressed argument of the Delegation of the Union of South Africa on these aspects. It does seem clear, as a matter of common sense, that discrimination on grounds of race and color is contrary to the spirit of the Charter, and that there is certainly nothing in the Charter which prohibits or discourages the United Nations from making a declaration of sentiment on such a subject. Indeed, the contrary could be cogently argued. It seems equally clear that common sense also indicates that the wiping out of discrimination cannot be effectively imposed by force from without, and that the best chance for progress lies in moving the hearts of men.

The United States Delegation hopes

that progress will be made and that it will be sure and steady. We will welcome all reports of progress from whatever part of the world they may come—from the United States, from the Union of South Africa and from India, or elsewhere.

Whatever the legal flaws of any pending proposal may be, this is not essentially a legal question. It is a burning question which goes to the fundamentals of man's humanity to man. It is a spiritual question on which massive statements are found in the world's great religions.

"NEITHER JEW NOR GREEK"

We are men of many faiths here. For us who are Christians, St. Paul said: "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female; for ye are all one in Christ Jesus." In the Bible, the Book of Leviticus tells us: "But the stranger that dwelleth with you shall be unto you as one born among you, and thou shalt love him as thyself."

For you who are Buddhists, there is the declaration: "All men are equal."

For you who are Hindus the *Bhagavad Gita* says: "Those whose minds

are thus set on equality have even here overcome their being. God is pure, and is the same in all. Therefore, they are established in God."

For you who are Jews it is written in your ancient books: "The heathen is thy neighbor, thy brother—to wrong him is to sin."

For you who are Moslems the Koran quotes God as saying: "We have divided you into tribes and nations for greater facility of intercourse and recognition among you; the most honored among you in the sight of God is the one who leads the most righteous life." The Prophet says: "Men are all equal like the fingers of a hand," and "you are all descended from Adam and Adam was created out of clay."

Mr. President, these are voices to which the United Nations cannot turn a deaf ear.

I understand that representatives of all three parties have expressed their earnest desire to find a peaceful way.

My Delegation favors the initiative by the Delegation of Brazil, supported by the Delegations of Bolivia, Denmark, Norway and Sweden. As the distinguished Delegate from Brazil pointed out in submitting his

Resolution, it is our concern "to employ all our diligence and resources to bring about a permanent and satisfactory solution to this matter."

I am convinced that if we are to give real meaning to our obligations under the Charter, we must continue to encourage the parties to thresh

out their differences in the light of the broad aims of the Charter, and to hope that with patience and understanding these persons, whether Indian, Pakistani, or South African, who have direct responsibilities for these matters will respond to the initiative of the Assembly in the same spirit which prompted it.



The Crime of Liberalism

Of the Communist attitude to the rights of the human person we have no doubt; it is to deny him all rights save as part of the Collective, a mere individual unit in the Soviet system. The Hammer and Sickle dealt destruction to the Christian ideal of personality with swift and brutal violence: the Sickle severed his spiritual roots, the Hammer crushed him into absolute conformity with the millions of fellow citizens of the U.S.S.R. and battered God's archetypal image in his soul past all recognition and remembrance. The conspiracy of debased democracy against the individual has not been so obvious because it has been so gradual and unpremeditated. The process began with the growth of Liberalism, itself the product of the Reformation. The belief in a personal God Who created man to His image and likeness gave way to the belief in Nature. When Rousseau raised the cry of *Retournez à la nature*, he proclaimed a general revolt against Supernature. The Liberalists of the nineteenth century who accepted him as their prophet burned the bridges of Grace behind them and, cutting themselves off from the world of the supernatural, prepared themselves to live in absolute freedom in the narrower region of pure nature. But, by turning his back on the world of Grace, the Liberalist man abandoned his claim to personal and inalienable rights which could no longer be justified, once he had rejected a personal God in Whose image and likeness he had been made.—*Liam Brophy in the CANADIAN MESSENGER OF THE SACRED HEART, December, 1950.*

The Reunion of Christendom

REV. J. GOOD, S.T.L.

*Reprinted from THE IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD**

ON 22nd November last, Canon R. R. Hartford spoke over Radio Eireann to members of the Church of Ireland on the subject of Christian Reunion. The many Irish Catholics who were undoubtedly listening must have wondered what it all meant—this reunion of the Churches, and they must have wondered especially what was the attitude of the Catholic Church to this movement. We do not intend to explain here the origin and growth of Reunion tendencies; we shall confine ourselves to the particular points raised by Canon Hartford's talk, especially in so far as they affect the Catholic Church.

In the world today there are many Christian denominations, all of them desiring in greater or less degree that unity which Christ in his last discourse asked the Father to give to his Church. First and foremost is the Catholic Church: realizing herself to be the One True Church, she has, since the first heretics left her fold in the early days, prayed unceasingly that they would return. In the last fifty years especially the Popes have, in their Encyclicals, frequently expressed this desire for the

return of all to the Church, and have done everything in their power to foster true Christian unity. The conception of unity which the Catholic Church proposes is not acceptable to separated Christians, but no one will question the earnestness and sincerity with which it is put forward.

We find it surprising, then, that Canon Hartford should have made no mention whatever of the attitude of the Catholic Church to reunion, and that he could discuss the subject of "Christian Reunion" without referring to the Church of Rome. If there is one point on which all reunionists agree, it is this: that the Reunion of Christendom without the Church of Rome would be a mockery. The Committee of the Lambeth Conference of 1908 placed on record its conviction that "there can be no fulfilment of the Divine purpose in any scheme of reunion which does not ultimately include the great Latin Church of the West," and this declaration was repeated verbatim by the Lambeth Conferences of 1920, 1930 and 1948.

Canon Hartford took as his ideal of Christian Reunion the agreement reached between the Anglicans and

* 41-42 Nassau St., Dublin, Eire, April, 1950.

the so-called "Old Catholics" at Bonn in 1931. The full text of the agreement is as follows:

1. Each communion recognizes the Catholicity of the other and maintains its own.
2. Each communion agrees to admit members of the other communion to participate in the sacraments.
3. Intercommunion does not require from either communion the acceptance of all doctrinal opinion, sacramental devotion, or liturgical practice characteristic of the other but implies that each believes the other to hold all the essentials of the Christian faith.

This agreement is put before us as a perfect realization of the principle *in necessariis unitas, in dubiis libertas, in omnibus caritas*. When, however, we examine the official teaching of the "Old Catholic" Church and compare it with the official teaching of the Anglican Church (in so far as such teaching exists), we realize that the *in necessariis unitas* applies primarily, in fact almost solely, to their common rejection of the Papacy. Beyond this great central point of agreement, there is wide divergence of faith between the two churches, as the Minutes of the Conference show. The two sides could not agree on a statement of the faith common to them both, and wisely decided that it would be better not to attempt such a statement at all, leaving merely the vague agreement that "Intercommunion does not require from either communion the acceptance of all doctrinal opinion . . .

characteristic of the other." Under the heading of doctrinal opinion upon which the parties agree to differ we might list the following: Tradition, Apostolic Succession, the Eucharist, Penance and other equally fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith. We presume that these differences are to be classed under the heading *in dubiis libertas*.

CHURCHES OF SCANDINAVIA

Relations with the Churches of Scandinavia were favorably reviewed in the talk with which we are dealing. There is no need for us to treat each of these Churches separately, but a few remarks about some of them will give an idea of their position in relation to the question of Christian Reunion. The Church of Sweden, with which the Church of England has almost full intercommunion, is a Lutheran Church which has, inconsistently with its Lutheran principles, retained government by bishops. While retaining episcopacy, it has, however, rejected officially the doctrine of Apostolic Succession dear to Anglo-Catholics, and teaches that the organization of the Church as laid down in the New Testament is not of obligation since the New Testament teaches the doctrine of "Christian freedom." (From the Swedish Bishops' reply to the 1920 Lambeth Appeal.)

The Church of Finland, another Lutheran Church with which the

Church of England is on good terms, believes that a priest can consecrate a bishop, and gave forceful expression to this teaching in 1884 when Professor Granfelt, a priest, "consecrated" Archbishop Rennall, from whom the whole Finnish hierarchy is descended. And despite the strong admonitions of the Church of England, the Church of Finland does not show any inclination to discontinue ordinations to the priesthood by a *simplex sacerdos* whenever a bishop is not easily available. In the Church of Denmark a few years ago three women were solemnly ordained to the priesthood. In view of these and other disturbing factors which we cannot discuss here, the relations of the Church of England with the Scandinavian Churches raise interesting problems.

RUMANIAN ORTHODOX CHURCH

Since the first years of the Reformation, the Church of England has endeavored to come to some understanding with the Orthodox Churches of the East, and the present century has seen redoubled efforts in this direction. After 1930 many Conferences were held between Anglicans and representatives of the Eastern bodies. Canon Hartford picked out for special mention the Conference with the Orthodox Church of Rumania held in Bucharest in 1935, probably because it was the only one in which a member of the Church of

Ireland took part. The choice was an unfortunate one for many reasons. The group of Anglican representatives at this meeting was not the ordinary body of negotiators under the experienced chairmanship of Bishop Headlam of Gloucester, but an entirely new body, completely unaccustomed to negotiating with Eastern theologians. The Report of the Conference bears the marks of this: it contains much that is plain misrepresentation of the doctrine of the Church of England, and was on that account rejected by the National Church League and by the Anglican Evangelical Group Movement. However, it was not only in England that the agreement was unacceptable. The meetings had to be held in strictest secrecy in Bucharest, and even when the parties had succeeded in reaching a compromise it was not considered advisable to publish the text of the agreement. The mere announcement that agreement had been achieved evoked a protest from the whole of the Rumanian clergy and almost caused a schism in that Church.

There is one interesting detail in the minutes of this Conference which may be of interest in view of the insistence that the Eucharistic doctrine of the Catholic Church does not correspond with that of the Eastern Churches. Here are some of the points contained in a statement submitted by the Rumanian delegates and accepted by the Anglicans:

3. The sacrifice on Calvary is perpetually presented in the Holy Eucharist in a bloodless fashion under the form of bread and wine through the consecrating priest and through the work of the Holy Ghost in order that the fruits of the sacrifice of the Cross may be partaken of by those who offer the Eucharistic Sacrifice, by those for whom it is offered, and by those who receive worthily the Body and Blood of the Lord.

4. In the Eucharist the bread and wine become by consecration, the Body and Blood of our Lord. How? This is a mystery.

5. The Eucharistic bread and wine remain the Body and Blood of our Lord as long as these Eucharistic elements exist.

6. Those who receive the Eucharistic bread and wine truly partake of the Body and Blood of our Lord.

These statements could conceivably be quotations from the Council of Trent, and on the other hand they cannot in any way be reconciled with the official formularies of the Church of England. Despite this fact the Report was approved by the Convocation of Canterbury in January, 1937. The Rumanian adventure was not on the whole a very happy one for the Church of England.

ANGLICAN ORDERS

Having dealt with the Bucharest Conference, Canon Hartford mentioned briefly the recognition of Anglican Orders by the various Orthodox Churches. Each of these acts of recognition is a story in itself, and we can mention only a few of the

more interesting details connected with some of them. The first and most important was the "recognition" by the Patriarchate of Constantinople in 1922. When the Anglicans realized that the Patriarchate was considering the validity of their orders, a "Declaration of Faith" was drawn up in May, 1922, and forwarded to the Patriarch. It ultimately received the signatures of 3,715 clergymen of the Church of England, and its wording gave the impression that the Anglican Church held officially for seven sacraments (which was simply untrue) and a real priesthood which was meant to "offer the unbloody sacrifice of the Eucharist for both the living and the departed; sacramentally absolve sinners who repent and confess their sins; and otherwise minister to the flock of Christ according to the ancient faith and practice of the Universal Church."

The latter part of the Declaration might be accepted as the teaching of a tiny minority of advanced Anglo-Catholics, but it was unquestionably not the faith of the Church of England. The whole affair was strenuously opposed by a great number of Anglicans under the leadership of Dr. Arthur C. Headlam.¹ However, the Patriarch accepted the document at its face value, and by a letter of 28th July, 1922, recognized Anglican Orders as valid. He added, however,

¹ Later Bishop of Gloucester.

a number of qualifications which made the recognition useless except as a piece of propaganda. He said that his decision would not become an "Oecumenical act" (and therefore fully binding) until it would be accepted by all the other Patriarchates, and he added that it did not authorize intercommunion between the two Churches or mutual administration of the sacraments. The Patriarchates of Jerusalem, Cyprus and Alexandria soon followed the lead given by Constantinople—a decision not entirely undue, we may well believe, to the fact that all three of them were under British political influence at the time. The Church of Rumania concurred in 1936 as a result of the Bucharest Conference of 1935 which we have already discussed.

These Orthodox recognitions of the validity of Anglican Orders provide little cause for rejoicing when one examines them more closely. It is a fundamental principle of Orthodox theology that a sacrament is valid solely within the fold of the Orthodox Church, and that Church is prepared to regard as valid sacraments conferred by non-Orthodox ministers only in very exceptional circumstances and by a *purely legal fiction* called Economy (*οικονομία*). In the eyes of the Orthodox, then, Anglican Orders are objectively invalid but the Orthodox may, by a purely legal fiction, accept them as valid, especially in cases where Anglican ministers be-

come converts to Orthodoxy. That this is the real meaning of the Eastern recognition of the Anglican Orders is stated explicitly in the latest declaration of validity—that by the Orthodox Church of Greece (21st September, 1939): "The Orthodox Church recognizes as valid without qualification only those sacraments which she has herself administered, but nevertheless the Church . . . recognizes by Economy the Ordination of those who come over to Orthodoxy." This is further emphasized by the absolute refusal of all the Orthodox Churches without exception to allow intercommunion with the Anglican Church. The phrase "relations of mutual respect and understanding" seems to sum up the total Anglican gains in the negotiations with the Eastern Churches.

ORTHODOX RUSSIAN CHURCH

We have not here mentioned the relations of the Church of England with the Orthodox Russian Church, as it is generally admitted that this Church is not entirely free from political control. We must notice, however, as being in full agreement with Orthodox theology, the statement of the Moscow Conference in 1948. This summed up under three headings the attitude of the Russian Church and of the Orthodox Churches generally to the Church of England: (1) The doctrine of the Thirty-Nine Articles differs from Orthodox teaching and will

have to be changed; (2) this change of doctrine will have to be made known officially to the Orthodox Churches; (3) Anglican Orders may then be recognized under the principle of *Economia*.

We need not deal here with the scheme of reunion in South India, as it has already been dealt with in the pages of the I. E. RECORD (January, 1948). From its beginnings in May, 1919, to the completion of the union in September, 1947, it has been a series of compromises, and among other anomalies it foresees the possibility of congregations formerly Anglican being served by a minister who rejects all the doctrine and liturgical practices of Anglicans. Nor is there any effective guarantee against lay celebration of the Eucharist in the new church of South India. In an open letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury entitled, "The Unity of the Faith," the Superiors of certain Religious Congregations in the Church of England wished to excommunicate all Anglicans who should have anything to do with the scheme, and offered to assist in setting up an independent Anglican Church in South India in an effort to withdraw the allegiance of those Anglicans who had already joined the new church. The Archbishop of Canterbury took no action.

Any discussion of Christian Reunion would be incomplete without a few words on the subject of the

Ecumenical Movement. This is intended to bring together the various Christian denominations to discuss questions of faith and order with a view to future reunion. Although the movement began in 1910, it was not until 1927 that the first great Conference on "Faith and Order" was held at Lausanne. The Reports and Minutes of this meeting make very interesting reading for Catholics: they show learned theologians of different Churches meeting together and talking completely at cross-purposes. The Reports are studied in their vagueness, and where agreement was reached it had to be vague enough to allow each denomination to take its own meaning out of the agreed formula. The disagreements are even more illuminating, as each group insisted on having its own view mentioned. Here is a good example from the Report of Section 3 of the Conference (on the Nature of the Church):

1. Some hold the invisible Church is wholly in Heaven; others include in it all true believers on earth, whether contained in any organization or not.
2. Some hold that the visible expression of the Church was determined by Christ Himself, and is therefore unchangeable; others that the one Church under the guidance of the Holy Spirit may express itself in varying forms.
3. Some hold that one or other of the existing Churches is the only true Church; others that the Church as we have described it is to be found in

some or all of the existing Communions taken together.

In view of this kind of theological floundering we need not be surprised at the action of the Orthodox delegation in insisting on reservations and exceptions at every step. At last, weary of the whole affair, they made a long declaration in which they stated that, apart from one Report which they accepted, "they were not to be regarded as having concurred in receiving any of the other Reports." The whole Conference was a series of clashes of opinion, and there was such absolute disagreement over the Report on "The Unity of Christendom and the Relation thereto of the existing Churches" that the delegates failed to find any formula that would be acceptable to all, and had to leave the drawing up of a Report on this subject to a Continuation Committee. We can fervently thank the Decree of the Holy Office (8th July, 1927) which declared it unlawful for Catholics to be present at such a Conference.

FURTHER DISAGREEMENT

Undaunted by the failure of the Lausanne Conference, the leaders of the Ecumenical Movement planned their next Conference for Edinburgh in 1937. Again the disagreement was fundamental, but this time the delegates agreed that they disagreed and said in their Report: "We are led to the conclusion that behind all par-

ticular statements of the problem of corporate union lie deeply divergent conceptions of the Church." In the Report of the Edinburgh Conference there is the same indefiniteness about the visible and the invisible Church, though this time the Conference went so far as to tell us that "their limits are not exactly co-terminous." That is not very helpful when you cannot define what exactly the visible Church is and what the invisible Church is. The next Conference is planned to meet in Sweden in 1952. Meanwhile the work of the Ecumenical Movement is being carried on by the World Council of Churches, and this latter body held its first assembly in Amsterdam in the summer of 1948. Despite the fact that practically all the great non-Catholic theologians were present (the list included among others, Barth, Brunner, C. H. Dodd, Nygren, Niebuhr) nothing worthy of note was achieved on the subject of Christian Reunion.

There are many other points raised by Canon Hartford in his talk that might be dealt with here. From what has been said, however, it should be clear that it is not lack of interest that is keeping the Catholic Church from joining the reunion movement. The Holy See has always desired and striven for the reunion of Christendom, and a recent Instruction from the Holy Office has underlined this desire. On 20th December, 1949, it issued a decree on the sub-

ject of relations between Catholics and non-Catholics. This decree praised the "excellent work of 'reunion'" and allowed bishops to give permission for diocesan conferences held with a view to "reunion." It insisted, however, that from the Catholic side the conditions of reunion remained the same, and that the only purpose of reunion conferences is the

return of non-Catholics to the One True Church. "To us in this country," said Cardinal Griffin in his Lenten Pastoral this year, "reunion can only mean the resumption of that unity which was destroyed at the time of the Protestant Reformation. A call for reunion means an invitation to all non-Catholics to join the One True Church."



Time Is Running Out

By simply doing nothing, remaining apathetic and aloof, we help to perpetuate an unnatural state of things—the existing disunion and disharmony in industrial society. In doing so we leave the door wide open for any agitator to raise the cry of "class war"; for industrial war and industrial unrest is only the prelude to an evil far greater, far more inhuman, far more widespread and fraught with fearful consequences not to one group or one class but to all classes of society. It is the return to barbarism, to paganism, where no diluted form of Christianity will avail to check the ruthless tyranny of men who, having rejected and outlawed God, will not scruple to reject and outlaw man, the creature made to the image and likeness of God. This evil is already exercising a brutal tyranny over a large part of Europe and Asia where, with diabolical cunning, under the guise of freeing men from oppression and misery, it has destroyed or enslaved whole peoples. It has achieved what we think impossible—unity in Industrial Society, but the bond of union is neither justice nor love, but fear and terror. There is no industrial war in Soviet Russia nor in her satellite Eastern European States for the simple reason that there is no freedom of action or speech or thought permitted; and there cannot be abuse of freedom—industrial war—where freedom itself is non-existent. The handwriting is on the wall: it is time we took notice of it.—*Robert A. Connolly in the IRISH MONTHLY, November, 1950.*

Our Lady of Fatima

H. DE LA COSTA, S.J.

An address delivered at the First Friday Club, Boston, Mass., November 3, 1950.

THERE are three details about the apparitions of Our Lady at Fátima which strike us as particularly significant. The first is that the Mother of God revealed herself to the three favored children, Lucia, Jacinta and Francisco, as a Lady of Light. Father McGlynn, a Dominican sculptor, was recently commissioned to model a statue of Our Lady of Fátima which should be as accurate as possible, under the personal direction of Lucia herself. To him, Lucia described the Lady of her vision as "all of light." The tunic and mantle in which she appeared were distinguishable only as two "waves of light"; the folds of her dress were not really folds but "undulated light"; the gold edging of her mantle was simply an intenser light; and even her immaculate flesh was a "flesh-like light." On all this Lucia was most insistent with poor Father McGlynn, who was forced to express her vision of light in common stone.

The beginning of each of the apparitions was invariably announced to the children by a lightning flash. While the apparition lasted, Jacinta and Francisco often had difficulty looking directly on the face of the

Lady because its brightness hurt their eyes. Many of the apparitions were accompanied by unusual changes in the color of sunlight, which others besides the children experienced. Finally, when Lucia asked the Lady to work a miracle which would convince people that she was telling the truth, her request was granted; and the multitude present at the last apparition at Fátima, freethinkers and skeptics as well as the devout, saw with their own eyes the great miracle of the sun. Light, then, dazzling light, would seem to be one of the dominant themes of Fátima; and it may not be altogether a coincidence that the eldest of the three children, the one to whom Our Lady principally addressed herself, was christened Lucia: a derivative of our Latin word for light.

The second interesting fact is that there was one element which was always present in all the messages communicated by Our Lady to the three children. These various messages differed in almost every other detail. Our Lady issued commands or made statements in some which she did not repeat in others. But to one portion of her message she always

returned; as far as I can make out, she always mentioned it whenever she spoke. What, then, is this nucleus, this hard core of the message of Fátima? It is the fact of sin; our need to realize the gravity of sin; our need to make reparation for our sins and the sins of others.

REPARATION FOR SINS

In the first apparition, Our Lady asked the children "to offer yourselves to God to submit to all the sufferings that He will send you in reparation for sins by which He is offended and in supplication for the conversion of sinners." In the second apparition she commanded the children to say the rosary daily, interpolating between each mystery the following invocation: "O my Jesus, forgive us; deliver us from the fire of hell; take all souls to heaven, especially those in most need." In the third apparition Our Lady told the children to offer up their daily rosary, with the five invocations in behalf of sinners, for the peace of the world, thus suggesting that there exists an essential connection between avoidance of sin, between reparation for sin, and the establishment of world peace. In the fourth apparition the children were again asked to make sacrifices for sinners. In the fifth apparition the message of the third apparition was repeated. In the sixth and last apparition, that of October 13, 1917, when the miracle of

the sun occurred, the final words of Our Lady were clear and explicit: "People must amend their lives and ask pardon for their sins. They must not offend God any more; He is already much offended." And when Lucia asked her whether there was anything more she wanted, the Lady replied, "I want nothing more," and vanished.

Thus, even a rapid review of the apparitions must convince us that the one abiding note in the messages of Fátima was Our Lady's insistence on the fact of sin, the necessity of avoiding sin, and the importance of making reparation for sin, coupled with her suggestion that it was somehow upon people realizing this important and necessary fact that the peace of the world depended.

The impact of their supernatural experience on the three children corroborates this conclusion. In all of them the dominant effect of the apparitions was a deepened sense of the evil of sin and a dogged determination to make up to God for it by the continual practice of mortification. With the boy, Francisco, in particular, the desire to make reparation or, as he put it, to "comfort" God in His sadness over the sins of men became a ruling passion. Speaking about his imminent death he said: "Soon Jesus will come to take me to heaven with Him and then I shall always be able to comfort Him." We usually think of heaven as that happy state in

which we are consoled by God; but to this little boy of nine, heaven was being able to console God for all eternity. Surely we must count such depth of mystic love in one so young as not the least of the miracles of Fátima.

Side by side, then, with the theme of light, there is this second theme of conflict with and reparation for sin, insisted upon as an urgent and immediate need, because upon it depends not only the salvation of souls but the peace of the world.

CONVERSION OF RUSSIA

The third theme is perhaps the most widely publicized because it concerns Russia. In 1929 Lucia, already by that time a lay sister, wrote to the Holy Father asking him to consecrate Russia to the Immaculate Heart of Mary. There is some doubt as to whether the Pope received her message in the form in which she drafted it. At any rate nothing was done about it until 1943, when Pope Pius XII consecrated the whole world, with special mention of Russia, to the Immaculate Heart. A year previously, Lucia wrote that Our Lady at her second apparition in July, 1917, had said: "If my demands are listened to, Russia will be converted and there will be peace. Otherwise Russia will spread her errors throughout the world, arousing wars and persecutions of the Church."

There is some hesitation about ac-

cepting this communication as authentic. Those who object to it allege that there was no mention of it at the time of the apparitions, but only at the very late date of 1942, when it was clear to all that Communism was a potential threat to world peace. Moreover, we do not have for this as for the other Fátima messages the corroborative evidence of the other two children, Jacinta and Francisco, both dead. It rests entirely on Lucia's bare assertion.

On the other hand we still have the draft of Lucia's letter to the Holy Father petitioning for the consecration of Russia to the Immaculate Heart of Mary, and that was written in 1929, fully seven years before the Communist attempt to seize power in Spain. And Lucia, in spite of all the difficulties and doubts, has stuck firmly to her statement.

We cannot hope to solve this problem here. But we may, I think, consider at least as solidly probable that Lucia did receive some communication from Our Lady regarding Russia, even if we cannot be quite sure when or where. Nor are we sure of the exact terms of the message, because, as Lucia herself is careful to point out, it was not so much that she *heard* Our Lady speaking to her in so many words, "it was rather the *sense* that came to me and I put what I understood into words." And she adds—as have all the great mystics before her who have tried to tell us

something of their ineffable experience—"It is not easy to explain this."

But what Lucia understood from Our Lady we can all by this time understand: that the peace of the world depends to a great extent on Russia; that if Russia is to keep the peace she must have a change of heart; that such a change of heart does not seem possible save by a miracle of grace; and hence that it is up to us to do what we can to win that grace. It may be that we did not need a revelation of Our Lady to see this; but I think we did need that revelation to see it in focus, in its true proportions; to have its importance, its terrible urgency, brought home to us; and, above all, to enable us to grasp its relationship with the other two themes of Fátima, the theme of light and the theme of sin.

FRONTIERS OF CHRISTENDOM

If we look back and examine the various manifestations of Our Lady of which we have historical record, we shall note a curious fact. It is that these manifestations, whether they be an apparition, or a doctrinal definition, or a sudden upsurge of popular piety, have invariably taken place at the frontiers of Christendom, and precisely at that frontier which is most in danger from enemy attack or cowardly betrayal. During the Middle Ages these frontiers were geographical, because the attack on Christendom was mainly a physical

attack by destructive outside forces. And so it is that if you were to take a map of medieval Spain and Portugal, and were to draw a line through the great historic shrines of Our Lady, from Our Lady del Pilar in the northeast to Our Lady of Alcobaça in the southwest, you shall have drawn the line where the Iberian chivalry stood fast against the Moor, and slowly, painfully, trusting in their swords but much more in the Mother of God, after how many routs and reverses, drove him southwards to the Pillars of Hercules.

So, too, it was not to Charlemagne at the quiet center of Christendom but to King Alfred at its stormy rim that Our Lady appeared in vision; and that in a darker hour for England than ever Dunkirk was, when the heathen Danes of the North bid fair to put the torch to every Christian thing on the island. She gave him, in the words of Chesterton's great ballad, nothing but "joy without a cause . . . faith without a hope," but in the strength of that hopeless faith Alfred struck down the Dane and saved England for Christendom.

Go east, then, from the shrine of Our Lady of Walsingham; across the Channel; walk across the breadth of Europe; and you will know that you have reached another frontier when you see the spires of Our Lady of Czestochowa, planted like a battle standard where the knights of Poland held at bay the plunging hordes

of Tartary and Kazak. Our Lady was a soldier in that iron age, because the bitter times demanded it; she was Our Lady Help of Christians before the gates of Vienna, and at the great sea battle of Lepanto, Our Lady of Victory.

But the frontiers of Christendom, the points of pressure and peril, are not always geographical. They are often also, and especially in our own time, when Christendom is divided against itself, frontiers of the mind and the spirit. One of the great crises in the colonization of the New World came when conquering Spain wavered for a moment in her policy towards the conquered native. Was he to be exploited as chattel or respected as a human being? Driven to the hills and allowed to perish, or patiently taught the arts of peace and the faith of Christians? The Church spoke fearlessly for the native through her missionaries—a Las Casas, a St. Peter Claver; but it was really Our Lady who decided the issue. She decided it by appearing to a poor ignorant Mexican Indian, at the place where the shrine of Guadalupe now stands, and addressing him as "My child"—thus proving more conclusively than all the rhetoric of Las Casas that the brown man and the red man and the black man are men; and that as men they were her children, as dear to her as their white masters, dearer, in fact, because they were weaker and needed her protec-

tion more. Spain heeded the message of Guadalupe, and her faithfulness to it is the measure of her civilizing achievement, as her occasional lapses from that sublime ideal of Christian brotherhood are the measure of the imperfections in the enduring monument that is Spanish America.

THE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION

In the nineteenth century the main attack on Christendom was directed against the intellectual basis of our faith, and the spearhead of that attack was the lucid, incisive and devastating rationalism which the French intellectuals tipped with the poison of mockery. They equated religion with superstition and identified miracles with myth; science, they cried, had destroyed faith forever. It was then, at the very height of their triumph, that Our Lady appeared to a peasant girl of Lourdes and said: "I am the Immaculate Conception." The Immaculate Conception—one of the most stupendous miracles of our Catholic Faith, and she proceeded to certify it by a whole series of miracles at Lourdes, miracles of healing which the scoffing scientists could not explain and cannot to this day; miracles which blunted the edge of the rationalist scalpel and brought many a skeptic in simple faith to the feet of the Mother of God.

And so now, in our lifetime, Our Lady has appeared once again at the frontier of Christendom, pointing out

to us where the main battle rages, what the line is that we must hold, which way lies victory. Fátima is that frontier. Once again we are on Iberian soil, where in 1936 atheistic Communism made its first bloody bid for Europe—and lost. But make no mistake. It lost, but was not beaten. It will try again, and yet again.

How may we meet this peril? Our Lady has told us how in the threefold theme of Fátima. Upon the conversion of Russia, and of all those in every nation who are advancing the cause of Russian Communism, depends the peace of the world. How to bring about this conversion is not merely an economic or a social or a political problem. It is above all a moral problem. It is really the problem of sin.

Not their sin alone; Our Lady of Fátima is very clear about that. *Our sin*, too; for heavy though the guilt of the Communist leaders may be, we are in part responsible. Through our social injustices, through heartless exploitation of the workingman and of colonial peoples, through the

mad pursuit of sinful pleasure while the less fortunate die of hunger and disease, we are in part responsible for the triumphs of Communism. It is this wall of sin, our sin as well as theirs, that stands between Communists and their conversion.

How shall we tear down this wall? First and foremost, by throwing light upon it; by exposing it for what it is. It is our modern fashion to call sin by everything save its right name. It is an economic maladjustment; it is an environmental defect; it is a psychological trauma; it is political necessity . . . No! It is none of these things. It is sin; the rebellion of man against the law of God. Call it by its right name; bring it out into the light. Then we can deal with it: renounce it by repentance, make up for it by suffering. Light: that is what we need most of all. Light amid the deepening darkness of the Atomic Age. For the heart of our crucial problem, the problem of peace, is the fact of sin; and to dispel the darkness of that dark heart it is to Our Lady of Light that we must go.



Food for the Mind

It would seem that we must recognize one essential fact: the life of the mind is not something which moves in fits and starts. It is not like a hot-water faucet which can be turned on and off at will. We're using our minds—we're living an intellectual life on some level—during every waking hour, even while we're reading a magazine or watching a movie. Many of us feed our minds only pablum, and wonder why they are not strong.—TODAY, October, 1950.

An Appeal to St. Thomas More*

HENRY BENDER, JR.

THOMAS MORE, counselor and advocate learned in the law, chancellor of charity and jurist of justice, merry martyr, scholar and canonized saint, may the Lord of all law and of all lawyers make me at your request a little more like you today than I was yesterday.

Pray that, for the greater glory of God and in the pursuit of His justice, I may be able in argument, accurate in analysis, strict in study, correct in conclusion, candid with clients, honest with adversaries, faithful in all details to the faith. Sit with me at my desk and listen with me to my client's tales, read with me in my library, and stand beside me in court, so that today I shall not, in order to win a point, lose my soul.

Pray that my wife and children may find in me what they have a right there to seek—humor and humility, cheerfulness and charity, an approach to wisdom, counsel, sound consolation and a little bit of the shadow of you.

Saint Thomas More, brother lawyer, who by your membership has proven our sullied profession not only honorable, but also compatible with stout masculine sanctity, pray for us now engaged in the struggle to imitate our Divine Master.

Lord Chancellor, stand retained by us before the Infinite Lord Justice Who will preside when we are to be tried.

* This prayer has received the imprimatur of the Archdiocese of Newark. The author is a lawyer and a member of the staff of St. Peter's College Institute of Industrial Relations, Jersey City, N. J. He is also prominent in Holy Name affairs.

Is the Catholic Press Necessary?

DR. JOHN J. O'CONNOR

Georgetown University

*An address delivered at the National Catholic Educational Press Congress
at Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wis., December 2-4, 1949.*

THE temptation that confronts Catholics today is the temptation of withdrawal, of turning away from active participation in community and world affairs, of abandoning the sordid world to its own atomic destruction. The present secularist atmosphere in society is so hostile to supernatural values that Catholics, who defend the supernatural view of life, are admittedly hemmed in and hard pressed on every side.

This acute sense of the secularist world's overpowering force, and the apparent hopelessness of making headway against it, turns the Catholic editor and writer too much in on himself, or at least on his own exclusive circle of the elect. The temptation is to become a mutual admiration society.

There have been periods in history when a defensive attitude was essential for survival, when to keep a small undamaged light still burning was all that could be demanded of the faithful. This withdrawal became necessary, for example, in the Dark Ages. The obstacles to an integral Christian life were so overwhelming that only in monasteries was such life practic-

able. Only there was culture of any sort safeguarded and passed on to the world in better times. Such conditions may yet prevail in the United States. We may be entering another Dark Age when all spiritual values will be denied and all Catholic participation in the active life of nations become impossible.

That time, however, has not yet arrived; it may never arrive. We do not know the future. What we do know is that there is a danger of defeatism, a danger of mistaking inaction for patience, and sloth for wisdom. If the Catholic laity possessed the courage and dynamism that our faith demands, small as our numbers are, we could change the world, we could conquer it, we could restore all things in Christ. The inaction and ineffectiveness of Catholics, and particularly the Catholic press, is one of the most serious accusations against us today.

Catholic editors and writers must meet this immediate challenge. The Catholic press must be something more than a glorified bulletin board, announcing the hours of Sunday Masses, and the dates of turkey and

ham suppers in various parishes. It must become something more than an intermural gossip sheet.

The American Republic is 160 years old. Yet the Catholic press has been described, in 1949, as "a big, growing, gangling boy, pretty much all feet and legs and hands, awkward, lacking poise, lacking intellectual and religious maturity, not yet conscious of its own strength." The Catholic press is still said to be in its adolescence, but looking forward to the day when it will be, in its strength and influence, as "a man among men."

I would say that, after 160 years, it is high time the Catholic press came of age. Its present stature is not only pathetic but unnecessary and inexcusable.

Any genuine hope of improvement rests with Catholic young men and women who are vitally interested in the problems of Catholic journalism, are now acquiring journalistic training and experience, and can be relied upon, in the troubled years ahead, to concern themselves with the great and tremendously important apostolate of the written word.

My remarks this morning will be devoted primarily to a few constructive suggestions as to how the Catholic press might get out of the ghetto, might emancipate itself from the shallow back-waters of American life, might begin, at long last, to make a vital and necessary contribution to-

wards the building of a new Christian world order.

The function of the Catholic press today, in my opinion, is to foster and promote, with all its strength and resources, the long overdue Christian revolution.

"A strong Christian," Cardinal Saliège reminds us, "is not a part of a system. He is a revolutionary in the good sense of the word. He revolts against all injustices, but especially against those which do not affect him."

The Christian revolution is a vast subject, but at least we can explore the following five aspects of it:

1. The Catholic Press and Social Reform.
2. The Catholic Press and Catholic Action.
3. The Catholic Press and the Modern Intellectual Life of the Church.
4. The Catholic Press and the Modern Spiritual Life of the Church.
5. The Catholic Press and the Modern Interracial Life of the Church.

SOCIAL REFORM

The Catholic press is in a position to make a major contribution towards a Christian revolution by translating the social encyclicals of the Popes into actual daily practice.

It is not enough for a Catholic weekly to quote the encyclicals or to hire some columnist to quote them;

it is a matter of the utmost urgency, indeed a matter of sheer survival, that all of us begin to live them. A Catholic newspaper office is an ideal place to demonstrate to the journalistic profession, and to the world at large, just what Leo XIII and Pius XI were talking about.

The time has come to put a stop to mere theorizing and random speculation on the social doctrine of the Church—as an end in itself. We have already had enough verbalization of the encyclical to last us until the end of the century. What most people are patiently waiting for—nearly sixty years after *Rerum Novarum* and nearly twenty years after *Quadragesimo Anno*—is for Catholics to apply them in their own enterprises.

Thus far most of us have been sitting supinely by, waiting for the other fellow to assume the burdens of our own social apostolate. The Papal encyclicals, for example, are read in Communist meetings, to our immense shame and confusion. We are the objects of a bitter and highly effective Communist indictment that we do not practice what we preach. We can answer that indictment in only one way—by practicing what we preach.

This obligation might very well be assumed by the Catholic press in dealing with its lay personnel. Such questions as trade unionism, sickness and accident benefits, the

just wage, collective bargaining, pensions, racial discrimination, seniority rights, and such matters are, or should be, of immediate concern to Catholic management and labor alike.

In addition to putting its own house in order, wherever that is necessary, the Catholic press should encourage the practice of social justice among all other Catholic institutions. This would include schools, colleges, hospitals, cemeteries, and all other Catholic enterprises where lay workers are employed.

Furthermore, a survey might be taken to find out to what extent Catholic businessmen, Catholic professional men, Catholic labor leaders and Catholic housewives are acquainted with the Papal encyclicals and are putting them to work in their respective fields of influence.

If the Catholic press, by its ardor for social justice, can demonstrate to the world the value and practicality of the social encyclicals of the Papacy in concrete terms, it will be making a very great contribution to the reconstruction of the social order.

CATHOLIC ACTION

Another consideration we might direct our attention to is the Catholic press in relation to Catholic Action.

The Papacy has said that Catholic Action is not just another optional Catholic activity, to be added on to

other existing Catholic organizations. On the contrary, Catholic Action is the basic Papal solution to the present global crisis. It involves the immediate mobilization of the laity and the participation of the laity in the hierarchical apostolate. No one, according to the Papacy, is exempt from this necessary service.

Yet the Catholic press in the United States has done much to confuse and distort the Papal program almost beyond recognition. In the first outburst of journalistic enthusiasm, about a quarter of a century ago, the term Catholic Action was applied to everything from bingo to female altar societies. When everything had become hopelessly confused, the Catholic press dropped the controversial subject entirely. Today, as a consequence, very few Catholics know anything about Catholic Action.

This is not to deny that, despite great obstacles and handicaps, Catholic Action groups have struggled into existence. But most of these groups are not making much progress because the Catholic press and other Catholic educational agencies have failed to provide the intellectual maturity and leadership which these youth groups so desperately need.

Any discussion of the problem of Catholic Action would be unrealistic if it did not bring into clear focus the relationship of the clergy and the laity. I can only express one lay-

man's view by saying that the present outmoded relationship is unsatisfactory.

The remark is frequently made, for example, that the diocesan paper is edited by the clergy for the clergy. This means that a diocesan paper is frequently used as a substitute pulpit for the teaching of catechism, either in fully reported sermons or otherwise. It means that most of the news concerns the clergy—living and dead. It means that practically all national columnists are clerics. It means that when a regional meeting of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine is held, the diocesan paper devotes a double-page spread to photographs of Confraternity leaders. On a recent occasion, out of a total number of 40 such photographs, 39 were of the clergy and one was of a layman. The total number of people participating in the convention was 2,000.

A PROLETARIAN CLASS

A fellow historian, Dr. Willis D. Nutting of the University of Notre Dame, has said that the modern Catholic laity have the sociological aspects of a proletarian class.

The proletariat is composed of people who have no function in society. They simply "go along." They do not participate, rationally and actively, in what society does; they simply constitute the material that is worked with. They are the *plebs*

contribuens, furnishing the unskilled labor, the cannon fodder and some of the money.

The average Catholic layman, Dr. Nutting points out, is not a proletarian in secular society. There he is conscious of a function, a responsibility, a dignity. As a citizen of the state he does not fall behind others. But in the City of God he acts like a proletarian and, perhaps, feels himself one. He shows the proletarian character. He is passive; he is without sense of responsibility; he has to be herded and threatened and cajoled to do what he knows he ought to do. When the pressure is relaxed, he resumes his doing of nothing.

I think it is true to say that, in the past, the laity were expected to contribute towards the support of their pastors and to maintain a Trappist silence. I agree with Dr. Nutting that this is still the lot of the vast majority of the proletarian laity in our large cities. The laity are not encouraged to develop leadership qualities, yet are severely censured for lacking those same qualities.

All this is commonplace. I would add, however, that there does exist today an ever increasing number of laymen and laywomen who are both competent and apostolic and who are seeking a completely new clergy-laity relationship. This is one phase of the Christian revolution and I believe the Catholic press should focus some attention on it.

A third consideration is that the Catholic press seems to be almost completely divorced from the modern intellectual life of the Church.

A READING PROGRAM

In this connection, I need only cite, with warmest commendation, the excellent example of one Catholic weekly, the *Los Angeles Tidings*, which recently inaugurated a broadly cultural reading program for its editorial staff.

The idea behind the reading program is to stimulate the staff workers and bring them up to date on standard Catholic works, so that names like Dawson and Maritain will be at least familiar to them.

During the forty-hour week, the staff members spend one-eighth of their time reading. The first hour and a half each day is allotted to them for this purpose. No interruptions are permitted, no telephone calls or assignments are given. The time is for reading. On Friday morning the staff members get together for an hour's discussion of the week's reading. According to the editor of the *Tidings*, "it is really stimulating to see how minds, which have not reacted to any serious reading for a long time, come to life under a sustained reading program and yield a rich return in ideas."

The books which form the core of the *Tidings*' reading program at the present time are: Ronald Knox's ver-

sion of the New Testament; *Theology and Sanity* by Frank Sheed; *Companion to the Summa* by Father Walter Farrell; *Spirit of Catholicism* by Karl Adam; Theodore Maynard's *Story of American Catholicism*, and Father Philip Hughes' *History of the Church*.

It is the opinion of many qualified observers that staff writers on Catholic weeklies throughout the United States are lamentably ignorant of books that, in their totality, constitute the living mind of the Church in our distraught atomic age. If an adult reading program is faithfully adhered to in Catholic press offices, the benefit to staff writers will be considerable and our intellectually impoverished Catholic weeklies will begin to reflect a deeper and more informed Catholic mind.

SPIRITUAL LIFE

My fourth observation concerns the Catholic Press and the contemporary spiritual life of the Church. It seems to me that the divorce here is almost as complete as between the Catholic Press and the modern intellectual life of the Church.

The Catholic Church in the United States is entering upon a period of great material expansion. New seminaries and convents are being built; others are being enlarged. From Washington to Los Angeles, new churches, schools, hospitals and various other charitable institutions are

being erected. Having only recently emerged from the "brick and mortar" stage of development of the nineteenth century, the Church must again concentrate its energies upon material necessities in order to take care of the physical and corporal needs of its people.

Back of this expensive plant expansion, however, is the amazing phenomenon of a quickening and deepening of Catholic spiritual life in the United States. A growing number of the laity are no longer interested in an anemic, threadbare and watered-down Christianity. Like Leon Bloy, they are rapidly becoming pilgrims of the Absolute. They repudiate half-measures and compromises of all kinds. They are hungry for the rich spiritual nourishment that is to be found in the writings of such masters of the spiritual life as St. Theresa of Lisieux, St. Theresa of Avila, St. Francis de Sales, and others. The popularity of Thomas Merton, and of the whole Trappist vocation generally, is an integral part of this new spiritual pattern. Some indication of the temper of the new spirit abroad in our land may be obtained by considering the following one-line back-cover appeal of a popular Catholic youth magazine: "Love God madly—there is so little time."

There is a great deal of humanitarian talk these days about love of neighbor. But our Catholic youth properly believe in emphasizing the

first and greatest commandment: Love God madly. It is this all-out spirit of complete dedication to the Trinity that characterizes Catholic life at the mid-century mark.

This new spirit is producing rich fruit—a growing interest in theology, in the liturgy, in the strengthening of family life, in literature and the fine arts, in the Christianization of the whole of one's personal and institutional life. We may be witnessing, to borrow Newman's phrase, a second springtime in the Church. Perhaps there is a direct connection between the martyrdom of the Church in Europe and Asia and the increasing fervor in our own country. Certainly the grace of the Holy Spirit is being poured out lavishly. This is an age unparalleled in the entire history of the Church—an age of miracles and heavenly visitations, the long-prophesied Age of Mary.

Yet how little of this new spiritual dynamism is reflected in the Catholic weekly press as we know it today. Unruffled and unchanged, the Catholic press seems to live in the nineteenth century, to reflect nineteenth-century viewpoints, to present to its small reading public the bare minimum standards of Catholic life. It identifies itself with the mass and not with the new élite, and thus the mass is not leavened and the élite does not receive that understanding and support which it has a right to expect.

Our final consideration directs attention to the divorce between the Catholic Press and the modern interracial life of the Church.

SERIOUS MORAL PROBLEM

The interracial problem is one of the most serious problems confronting the United States today. It is also one of the most serious moral problems confronting the Church today. Yet it is not apparent that the Catholic weekly press has really faced this issue. It continues to publish an increasing amount of interracial news and an occasional interracial photograph. But I do not regard this as at all adequate to the critical needs of the hour.

The new Atomic Age that is upon us demands an immediate reorientation in our social, economic, political and international relationships. In the shortest possible time we must close the gap between cosmic gadgets and wisdom, between intellect and conscience, between belief and practice.

In the political order, for example, we must close the gap between our democratic creed and certain shabby pretenses of democracy—pretenses rooted in racial isolation and exclusiveness.

In the moral order, a similar but more fundamental issue confronts us. Here we must close the gap between integral Christianity and the threadbare and obsolescent subter-

fuges of racial snobbishness and intolerance.

The Catholic Press has been an ardent foe of the Communist heresy for many years. The racist heresy has not received anything like the same attention. Yet it would seem to be the duty of the Catholic Press to combat the racist heresy with the same vigor, courage and determination that it is employing against Communism.

Thus far we have been discussing the Catholic Press in relation to those who share its philosophy of life. But the Catholic Press also has a mission to all of God's children without exception.

Christianity, by its very nature, reaches out to embrace the entire world, the whole human family. It offers the modern world unity, order and peace. It is the only power that can successfully cope with the satanic forces of evil that have entered the empty house of our secularist civilization. Only Christianity can save mankind from its deadly spiritual enemies.

This is our index of the unique importance of the Catholic Press. It must be alert, competent, apostolic.

It must identify itself, strongly and fearlessly, with the global mission of Christianity. It must be the voice of Catholic Action, the spearhead of the Christian revolution, the champion of all those who, in a darkening world, are fighting for justice, liberty and peace.

If we have faith in the power of the Holy Spirit, we must believe that all the evils of the modern world, however monstrous and formidable they may appear, can be conquered. The powers of this world, as Christopher Dawson reminds us, are blind powers which are working in the dark, deriving their strength from negative and destructive forces. They are powerless against the Spirit who is the Lord and Giver of Life. And in the same way all the new devices for the enslavement of mankind are powerless against those higher powers of spiritual understanding and love which are the essential gifts of the Holy Spirit.

The Catholic Press in the United States has a great mission and a great destiny. I am one of those who believe that, in this critical hour for all humanity, it will prove worthy of that mission and that destiny.



The broad brush of Socialism is used to tar many a program that has a solid basis in the principles of social justice that are explicit or implicit in the teachings of Christ.—*WAGE EARNER, December, 1950.*

International Unity

MOST REV. JOHN J. WRIGHT, D.D.

*Address of the Bishop of Worcester at Holy Cross College,
Worcester, Mass., May 17, 1950.*

THE liberal arts college, particularly the liberal arts college where religion and philosophy hold the dominant places, has a unique opportunity, it seems to me, to help accomplish in our generation that Will of God with which the well-being of mankind is identified.

Here in America and elsewhere among the nations we are witnessing a reaffirmation of national values and of national sentiment.

Much of this intensification of national sentiment is undoubtedly justified in the light of real threats to our national security. It is beyond question entirely reasonable that our executives and legislators should increase the natural patriotic vigilance which is the indispensable condition of national security.

Members of the liberal arts tradition, however, bound by their values to observe a larger measure of detachment still consistent with national loyalty, have the responsibility of remembering that such revivals of national emotion as we are now facing, however necessary political and social crises may sometimes make them, are never without grave danger

to the human spirit; they are never without grave danger of that immoderate exaggeration which leads to unbridled nationalism, aggressive imperialism and the shattering of human solidarity among the nations. The partisans of nationalism too often conclude by denying the very existence of universal values, of human interests transcending national lines of division, and therefore, in point of practical effect, they hamper and impede the progress towards that sane internationalism without which the hope of peace and social security, at home or abroad, is an empty illusion.

I submit that you who inherit the liberal arts tradition have a special vocation in this period of social crisis and world chaos. You are, or should be, the custodians of the true, the good and the beautiful—those things of the spirit which comprise human culture and which transcend all lines of national, racial and linguistic division. You are the expositors of all those scientific, artistic and cultural values which unite men across boundaries of an economic, political, or social nature. It may be

true that there exist such things as an American theory of government, an Italian population problem, an economic problem arising out of German industrialism, an English political interest, an Arab racial problem. But there is no such thing as an Italian truth; there is no such thing as German morality; there is no such thing as British culture in the sense of a culture isolated from that of the human family. The genuine literary, artistic and scientific patrimony of the race is *one*: we cannot speak, with literal accuracy, of an Irish mathematical system, a French criterion of truth, an American ontology.

True it is, hereditary differences, circumstances of environment and like considerations may produce civilizations, even "cultures," accidentally differentiated one from the other. Still, the essential elements of both civilization and culture remain *universal* in character, so much so that the more highly perfected a culture becomes, the more truly *human* it is, the more it transcends the particular bounds of a single people and identifies itself with the common cultural patrimony of humankind in general. The essential work of the true philosopher is never purely national in character. There is no possibility of discussing the thought of an Aquinas, an Augustine, or a Socrates in purely local terms; these men, and their thought, belong to all humanity.

Socrates is not merely some Greek who lived and died within given dates; in the words of the inevitable example of our college logic books: Socrates is a man.

You are the expositors of universal truths, of the things men hold in common. Therefore I argue that while others, mayhap, promote further human division, you and I are bound to keep alive the sense of human solidarity, the sane universalism which must ultimately prevail when all divisive factors in human society have done their work and gone their way. As philosophers, and, in the case of some of us, as priests, we must uncompromisingly fulfill our vocations as exponents of the universals as against the dividing particulars; our vocation must remain to be the soul of the world, to hold together its divided elements, however others may tear at its unity.

PAPAL EDUCATION PROGRAM

There is in the public pronouncements of the five most recent Popes an integral educative program, inspired by a philosophy of Catholic humanism and supernatural ethics, all calculated to produce, if it be faithfully followed, an "international-mindedness," a sane universalism, which will supplement, integrate and perfect the legitimate and necessary psychological and social demands of nationalism. To that program, in its briefest possible statement, I invite

your attention today. It is completely consistent with the nature and function of the liberal arts college.

The wisest and the best of the ancient philosophers and educators, however sublime the ideal of personal perfection they may have taught, never dared dream of the perfection of society by the realization of human solidarity. Socrates, and the twin geniuses who have transmitted to us all that was most perfect in the thought of his age, envisioned no social order more perfect than one still cramped and crippled by tribalism and racial division. Modern nationalism, to be sure, though it has frequently impeded the progress of our race towards international unity, is a great step from the social chaos of tribalism and toward the order of organic society. But the most cultured of pagan societies were a long way even from this. Aristotle does not even discuss the question of how peace is to be kept between his tiny State and the rest of the human race. Certainly, Aristotle shows no love for war as such; true he insists that "we make war for the sake of peace," a historic declaration, indeed, especially if one recalls how it has caught the political imagination of all Europe—of St. Augustine in his *City of God*, of Dante in his *Monarchy*, and of countless others. But Aristotle still looked on war as inevitable and considered human division into tribal or national groups as the normal and

necessary condition of society. So with Plato—the organization of his "Fair City" is a militant organization of fighting-men, and peace has little part in his ideal scheme of things.

RELIGION MADE JEWISH NATION

The vision of a world at peace, the dream of a human family organized in collaborative unity under a universal law, this vision which would have seemed foolishness to the Greeks of old was the strength of the ancient Jews. The Jews owed that vision to Revelation. It was *religion* that made the Jews a nation, and it was the consciousness of their religious vocation that opened to them the vista of internationalism. Whether or not one accepts with us the belief that God *personally* and *literally* called Abraham out from the tribal confines of Ur of the Chaldees to conceive in obscure beginnings a world ideal, a universal society that is still in painful travail, this much is certain: the first line in human literature which indicates a spirit of dissatisfaction with mere nationalism and a desire for a world vision is the line in the Hebrew Scriptures which declares that "the Lord said to Abraham: Go forth out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and out of thy father's house, and come into the land which I shall show . . . and in thee shall all the kindred of the earth be blessed. So Abraham went out as the Lord had commanded him" (*Genesis 12, 1-4*).

One even dares to say that if among the movements of the present time there is one which owes its beginnings to religion, however much it has lost its conscious connection with God, and which is still associated with religion in its very notion, it must be that movement which seeks to realize in the social order a human solidarity transcending lines of national or racial division, establishing a unity among mankind coextensive with the natural unity in which God created the human family in the beginning.

DREAM OF SOCIAL UNITY

This dream of a universal order among humans is part of the political heritage we owe the Judaeo-Christian tradition; it is as old as our religious history. It is implicit, as we have seen, in the vocation of Israel and it is echoed in the words of the prophets of Israel, Daniel and Isaías and Osee, even during the long generations in which Israel disciplined herself by religious *isolation* from the Gentile world. It is the most characteristic social doctrine of the Christian ethic; it is explicit in the social teaching of the *New Testament*, finding its most unmistakable expression in the words by which St. Paul described the Church of Christ at work as a leaven in the social world, a kingdom "where there is neither Gentile nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, Barbarian nor Scythian, bond nor free" (*Col. 3, 11*).

It is a dream which survived the secularization of Western civilization after the Renaissance, so that even when the religious values of early medieval Europe—values around which the hope of world brotherhood had been spun—even when these had been denied or denatured by skepticism and irreligion, still that dream haunted the minds of men who were sensitive to the unnaturalness of the bitter divisions which unbridled nationalism brought into the Western world. Hence a statesman like the minister of Henri Quatre, the diplomat Sully, though among the first statesmen to insist on the principle of nationality, was nevertheless haunted by the ancient religious dream of social unity when he longed to introduce his *Grand Dessein*, the great plan of a Universal Commonwealth.

So, too, the dream of human solidarity survived in the speculations of the legalist Grotius, founder of modern International Law, as well as in the misguided "reformed" Christianity of William Penn, whose plea for a "sovereign League of sovereign Nations" has a curiously contemporary air. Indeed, on this point, if on no other, even that most thoroughly naturalistic of social philosophers, Jean Jacques Rousseau, must have been unconsciously influenced by the ancient religious ideals of Western civilization when he argued that patriotism alone will never bring peace

to mankind, and that if peace is to come we must build a "great city of the world," in which States and Peoples are but individuals before the law.

Even in the intellectual anarchy of eighteenth-century Germany, the dream of human solidarity still found thoughtful men willing to pursue the hope of realizing it. Lessing gave the elements of this dream powerful expression in his *The Education of the Human Race*, and Immanuel Kant pauses in his treatise *A Suggestion for Universal History* to write in capitals this sentence: "The problems of a satisfactory constitution for any nation is bound up with the problem of law between nations, and the one cannot be solved without the other." He therefore pleads for "an education of the spirit for all citizens in every country" in order that nations will give up their lawless lives of conflict and enter into a "society of Nations (Volkerbund)."

The secular liberalism of the Risorgimento in Mazzini's Italy, even at the height of its nationalistic excesses and its professed break with the past, at least did not turn back on the ancient hope of a social order greater than the Sovereign State. Mazzini believed intensely in nationalism, but even he recognized that it is only an element in the larger human whole. The Italian Republicans of the last century were not wont to confess their indebtedness to the religious

traditions of their fatherland, but the impartial critic will sense that much indeed of Italy's centuries of Catholic culture is distilled into such passages from Mazzini as this from his *Essay on the Duties of Man*:

We improve with the improvement of humanity, nor without the improvement of the whole can you hope that your own moral and material conditions will improve. Generally speaking, you cannot, even if you would, separate your life from that of humanity; you live in it, by it, for it. Ask yourselves then whenever you do an action in the sphere of your country, or your family: If what I am doing were done by all and for all, would it advantage or injure humanity? and if your conscience answers, it would injure humanity, desist, even if it seem to you that an immediate advantage for your country or your family would ensue from your action. Be apostles of this faith, apostles of the brotherhood of nations, and of the unity of the human race—a principle admitted today in theory, but denied in practice. Be such apostles wherever and in whatever way you are able.

It is rare, indeed, that a priest of the Catholic Church can quote with any measure of endorsement the doctrines of Italy's nineteenth-century Jacobins, and if it is possible on this point to do so it is only because here the revolutionary speaks a doctrine which, like so many others, her enemies owe to traditional religion.

POET'S TRIBUTE TO CHURCH

It is with the thought in mind of this indebtedness to religion for their own highest social ideals, even on the

part of those who today profess least to love her, that a gifted European poet has written in tribute to the Church:

*You bless those too who no longer know of your blessing;
The world's compassion is your runaway daughter, and all the rights of man live on your bounty,
All the wisdom of men has been learned from you.
You are the hidden writing under all their signs. You are the hidden current in the depths of their waters.*

You are the secret power of their enduring.

The pronouncements of the Holy See on the moral aspects of the international problems arising out of nationalism do not treat these problems as the work of blind mechanical forces, "the laws of Economics," "the state of Industry," "the evolution of National Destiny"—these *daemons* and *demiurges*, eluding human control, of modern political philosophy. Rather the Holy See discusses such problems as the result of misguided *human activity* admitting of *reeducation and guidance*. Hence, again, the importance of the liberal arts in our day.

The student of papal pronouncements on nationalism soon discerns the broad outlines which the Popes have given as to what must be the *content* of the education by which nationalism as a principle of social

and political division may be corrected. Analyzed at length in his brief *Saepe numero considerantes*, the value of historical studies as a moral discipline was indicated by Pope Leo XIII in a published letter to an Italian historian. In this letter he declared that every age has recognized the utility of these studies as a means of shaping and directing souls. The study of their own legitimate national historical traditions, Pope Pius XI argues in the case of the religious separatists of the Oriental nations, will lead them to a recognition of how closely related are the origins of their traditions with those of the community whence they are separated, a recognition out of which will grow that sense of "solidarity in time," which, together with that of "solidarity in space," is a psychological basis of common society.

VALUE OF HISTORY

If the study of their own history will lead a people back to their historical bonds with others, so the study of the history of other peoples will develop an understanding productive of that sympathy which should prove a natural predisposition to Charity. Because no other subject admits so readily a perversion into an instrument of international antagonisms and exaggerated nationalism as does history, Pope Pius seeks the reform of methods of teaching history, and the sober use of historical

education as among the most important means in the liberal arts curriculum of correcting nationalistic excess.

In the other departments of formal education where national traditions or interests are a preoccupation, the role most consistent with papal directives is always to infuse these with that emphasis on universal elements in which consists the "sane humanism" for which Pope Pius XI pleaded so often. Especially in the fields of letters, philosophy and kindred studies, the Pope pointed out the necessity of recurring to those classical models which form the common patrimony of human education and provide a cultural universality to be adapted "in conformity with the exigencies of our times."

Christianity and its moral teaching concur perfectly with a sane humanism, as Pope Pius XI implied when he declared: "We are constantly crying out against whatever is not fully and truly human, and therefore Christian, against that which is inhuman, and therefore anti-Christian." Human wisdom, moreover, may serve as a mighty instrument for the establishment of international order and universal collaboration, but it is not sufficient in the absence of moral (and so religious) education. The Popes therefore insist not merely on sane humanism, but on that Christian humanism which blends supernatural wisdom with human learning and subordinates all things not to

reason alone, nor to revelation alone, but to reason and faith.

COORDINATE NATURAL FACULTIES

By such a twin subordination, Pope Pius XI argues:

The true Christian does not renounce the activities of this life, he does not stunt his natural faculties; but he develops and perfects them by co-ordinating them with the supernatural. He thus ennobles what is merely natural in life and secures for it new strength in the material and temporal order, no less than in the spiritual and eternal.

"Humanism," in the Holy Father's sense of the word, involves, as Father Gerald G. Walsh, S.J., has written, a return of our people and our nations to their ancient classical and Christian roots, in a word: to the Catholic Liberal Arts tradition. The argument of Father Walsh in this connection is at once so lucid and so persuasive that I venture to quote it at length:

Those roots are to be found in that *magna charta* of Christian humanism which appears in the account which St. Luke has left of the education of Jesus Christ. That education, we are told, consisted in docility to authority flowering in progress in the triple life of wisdom, of manhood and of Divine Grace, in what the Greek original calls *sophia, helikia and charis*. Sophia, wisdom, speculative thought is what set the Hellenic intelligence on fire. Helikia, virtus, practical human righteousness, is what the Roman conscience strove to make perfect. Charis, Grace, is the lovely and gratuitous favor which only God can give. The main point in that *magna carta* is that, when the In-

arnation brought Charis (Love) back to the world, it did not take away Sophia (Wisdom) and Helikia (Virtus). In one of her noblest hymns the Church sings that God who gives immortal crowns does not snatch away our mortal joys, "*non eripit mortalia qui regna dat caelestia.*"

"Catholic humanism" is, then, true "positivism," as Liberalism has proved itself to be, in fact, pure "negativism." Catholic humanism, whose ultimate preoccupation is with the Mysteries of Grace and Glory, has a proximate, but no less passionate, preoccupation with the natural values of truth, beauty and goodness; with the human perfection of our intelligence, our conscience and our taste; and still more warmly human things like economic prosperity, political order, family affection and personal freedom. Catholic humanism aims at human happiness; but it knows that the many roads to peace will only meet when reason is helped by Revelation in the search for truth, conscience with Divine counsels and commandments in the search for justice, and taste with supernatural Grace in the pursuit for beauty.

St. Augustine, Father Walsh reminds us, was fond of picturing to himself a possible world wholly at peace because filled with men at peace with themselves. "He meant men who had so disciplined their intelligence, their conscience and their taste that every passion of their sensitive nature was in harmony with the judgment of their reason, while this in turn was obedient to whatever light or law God has revealed." Without this threefold harmony, no "tranquillity or order" is possible.

"No education is capable of achieving the end (of establishing order in human society)," wrote Pope Pius XI to the American hierarchy, "save that in which the very inculcation of learning is grounded on religion and virtue," nor does the Pope mean here anything less than a strictly religious i.e., other-worldly, approach to the study of social problems. And it is here that the Church stands ready to make her chief educative contribution to the building of a better order.

For the Church does her utmost to teach and to train men, and to educate them; and by the intermediary of her bishops and clergy diffuses her salutary teachings far and wide. She strives to influence the *mind* and the *heart* so that all may willingly yield themselves to be formed and guided by the commandments of God. It is precisely *in this fundamental and momentous matter, on which everything depends*, that the Church possesses a power peculiarly her own. The agencies which she employs are given to her by Jesus Christ Himself for the very purpose of reaching the hearts of men, and derive their efficiency from God. They alone can reach the innermost heart and conscience, and bring men to act from a motive of duty, to resist their passions and appetites, to love God and their fellow-men with a love that is singular and supreme, and to break down courageously every barrier which obstructs the path to a life of virtue.

CHURCH ROLE IN EDUCATION

The efficacious means of education which the Church possesses and to which the Popes appeal have fre-

quently been referred by the Popes to the particular problem of nationalism and the division of which it has been the cause. For the most part these means constitute or flow from the Church's universal character, the character by which the Church is the foremost among the *de iure* and *de facto* bonds of the human community. In the education of the mind, the Church adds to instruction in the manifold natural bonds of human solidarity further instruction in a common supernatural Faith, the dogmas of which are grounded on human solidarity in One Creator, one first parent, One Redeemer, and one last end, so that Pope Pius XI could declare that the "erroneous idea" of exaggerated nationalism embodies "a whole doctrinal spirit contrary to the faith of Christ." This common faith Pope Leo declares to be capable of uniting men across the differences which constitute their national characters. History records that its power so to unite men was manifest when "it was looked upon as the common inheritance of one and all; when civilized nations, separated by distance, character, and habits, in spite of frequent disagreements and warfare on other points, were united by Christian faith in all that concerned religion."

Thus the Church alone possesses those means by which the supernatural perfection of individuals, their education in the full sense, for bal-

anced nationalism may be achieved; but also in the narrower sphere of strictly moral education she possesses a pedagogy peculiarly adapted to providing the inspiration and guidance necessary for producing in individuals, and therefore in nations, an exemplary national patriotism harmoniously blended with supernatural charity. This pedagogy we may call the *pedagogy of the imitation of the saints*, and we may note the pointed manner in which the Popes, notably Pope Pius XII, have lost no opportunity of employing this method of moral teaching, pointing out the exemplification of the Catholic harmony between national and international charity in the lives of the saints proposed for imitation.

It would be inaccurate to claim that the motive of the Popes in certain of the canonizations they have performed has been precisely to provide models of Christian internationalism for the guidance of our nationalistic generation. On the other hand, we must note that the Popes themselves have, in canonizing certain saints, made topical reference to the fittingness of proposing in these times saints in whom *patriotism and international charity* find a blend so happy as to make them providential exemplars of Christian international morality. The Popes have expressly commended such saints to the imitation of individuals in all nations, and especially of their compatriots. The

Church's saints are, then, a bond uniting men across national lines, but also, in the personal example which they provide, they are an educative means of intensifying that bond in the lives of individuals.

PURPOSE OF CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

The saints thus serve as a *means* in Christian moral education. It is, however, in the *end* of Christian education that its chief claim to provide the solution of excessive nationalism lies. According to Pius XI:

The proper and immediate end of Christian education is to cooperate with divine grace in forming the true and perfect Christian, that is, to form *Christ Himself* in those regenerated by Baptism, according to the emphatic expression of the Apostle: "My little children, for whom I am in labor again, until Christ be formed in you" (*Gal. iv, 19*). For the true Christian must live a supernatural life in Christ: "Christ who is your life" (*Col. iii, 4*), and display it in all his actions: "That the life also of Jesus may be made manifest in our mortal flesh" (*II Cor. iv, II*).

The entire difference between the supernatural morality of Catholic education and the inadequate morality which naturalism provides may be expressed in the light of this definition: naturalism teaches the person "all things are yours"; Catholicism teaches the same principle, but adds, "and you are Christ's and Christ is God's."

Naturally before any world order can become a reality there are tre-

mendous political, economic and social problems to be solved. Many of these are of a technical order, and in them the Church claims no special competence. Before any political or social organization can function, however, there must exist among the people who will comprise it a previous will for its existence; the great tragedy of the League of Nations, for example, was that it attempted to function in a vacuum, and was set up without references to any psychological or moral dispositions in its regard on the part of the people at large. Every government and every organization depends for its very life on the loyalty and hearty acceptance of the multitude within and under it. To the educative work required before this acceptance and loyalty can have roots deep enough to guarantee its survival despite inevitable discouragement and reverses, the Church can make an indispensable contribution.

Indeed, one may reasonably assert that the Church's contribution is the only one which cuts through to the basic difficulty which impedes the realization of world order. This problem, according to the late Nicholas Murray Butler, may be thought of as the modern and social form of the ancient philosophical problem of the antimony between "the One and the Many." This problem, in its social form, the Church of Christ has from the beginning been obliged to meet

and to solve. The problem of nationalism and of human divisions which the philosophy of nationalism has intensified is a problem arising out of an exclusiveness in charity. Through the Church, however, men become united with Christ, and through His Charity, diffused in our hearts, they achieve a union with one another which cannot do other than produce unheard-of wonders in social reconciliation. In Christ, Who is the Head of every man, all men find themselves united spiritually with one another; and so, by a truth as old as Saint Paul, the Church solves the social problem of the "One" and the "Many" for *we, being many, are one body in Christ and every one members one of another* (*Rom. xii, 4, 5*).

SUMMARY

To summarize: the liberal arts college, particularly one in the Jesuit hu-

manistic tradition, provides a philosophy which recognizes the historical intermingling of the natural and supernatural, and the consequent close interdependence of philosophy and theology, of reason and faith, if either is to bring men to their true last end of felicity here and hereafter. It also abundantly justifies itself as most likely to provide a cultural pattern consistent with human hopes for a united world.

These personal and social aspirations can be fulfilled only when our educational systems have become at once humanistic and Christocentric, when Theology, of which Philosophy was once proud to be the handmaid, has itself become, in a sense at least, the helpmate of Philosophy in aiding the latter to solve its most pressing practical problem of the moment: the problem of teaching men to live together in sanity and sanctity.



The Uncanonized

Every parish has its saints as well as its sinners. The longer we live in a parish, the better we become acquainted with its peoples, the less we perceive the sin and the more we can perceive the sanctity. The people we mentally canonize will probably never be elevated to sainthood by the Holy Father. But we know them, and the parish knows them, and the parish priest knows them. They themselves will be the last to discover what we think of them, and being saints they would scoff at the idea of their own sanctity. Never a saint but knows himself or herself for a sinner.—*Mary M. Wirries in the AVE MARIA, November, 1950.*

Catholic Labor Alliance

BOB SENSER

*Reprinted from OUR LADY OF THE SACRED HEART**

JUST the other day a man came back to the United States after six years in Japan. He looked to see what was "cooking" in the good old U. S. A.—whether much had changed in six years.

He found that television had invaded taverns and homes. He found that prices had gone up. He found that there were more outdoor movie theaters, more parking meters, more commercial buildings.

He found that something else had happened, too—a big change had come about, a change that made his heart warm.

"It seems to me that many of our Catholic people are waking up," he said. "They're taking an interest in the social teachings of the Church—in what the Church has to say about labor unions, about housing, about the rights of Negroes."

This opinion came from Dick Deverall, formerly labor adviser to General Douglas MacArthur in Japan. Before the war Deverall edited a pioneering magazine called *Christian Social Action*. Many times he and his paper were called "dangerously radical" and "Communist-minded" when all he did was to set forth fear-

lessly the teachings of the Popes. This tendency to brand Catholic social movements as "Communistic" still exists today—but it is far less widespread.

Fewer people lift their eyebrows in surprise when they read of a Cardinal addressing a convention of union officials. Fewer eyebrows go up when the Catholic Youth Organization of Brooklyn objects to the American Bowling Congress' exclusion of Negroes and Chinese.

Throughout the country there is a ferment going on among Catholics. Some of it gets publicity, some of it doesn't. Some of it is going on in an organized way, some of it is unorganized.

It all adds up to this: Catholics today are thinking—and doing more about their responsibilities to their fellowmen.

Perhaps this isn't much to brag about. After all, the Epistles and Gospels overflow with Christ's and His Apostles' advice to man that he love his neighbor as himself. Christ put it in the most clear-cut terms many times. He said, for example, that those who have this love for neighbor will join Him in heaven;

* Box 270, Dept., O.L., Aurora, Ill., May, 1949.

those who haven't will go "into the everlasting fire." And in the past few decades the vicars of Christ and successors of the Apostles, the Popes, have hammered home again and again how this love for neighbor must operate in industrial society.

So it's about time that modern Catholics turned an ear to the full teachings of Christ and His Church. Many have been content with praying on their knees on Sunday and then preying on their neighbor on Monday.

THE SOCIAL ENCYCLICALS

To rouse the praying and preying Catholics, the Popes wrote their social encyclical letters. Pope Leo XIII issued his encyclical letter, *On the Condition of Workers*, in 1891. Pope Pius XI wrote *On the Reconstruction of the Social Order* in 1931.

These two famous Papal letters are the guiding-posts for Catholics working for social reform. Inspired by them, many Catholic groups in the U. S. today are busy trying to help build a genuine Christian social order.

One such group is the Catholic Labor Alliance of Chicago. Considered all by itself, the Catholic Labor Alliance—or the CLA, for short—has no national significance. It has had no spectacular successes. Its leaders aren't Big Names in the news.

What makes the CLA important is that it is one part—however small

—of the Catholic social revival in the United States, a revival in which the layman is beginning to play his rightful part. The Alliance carries on its work largely through laymen—realizing (like Pius XI) that the "first apostles to the workers must themselves be workers" and (like Pius XII) that the laity are "in the front line of the Church's life."

The headquarters of the CLA is a corner office on the third floor of an old grey brick building belonging to the Holy Name Cathedral parish in Chicago. Actually the floors are so high that the climb is equivalent to five stories in an ordinary building. The CLA denies the insistent rumor that it chose the third floor in order to weed out all but the sturdiest members.

The Alliance shares the third floor with the Young Christian Workers and the Young Christian Students—U. S. counterparts of the Jocist movement of Europe. Together with the YCW and YCS, the Alliance made 3 East Chicago Avenue an important address in the Catholic social movement. (CLA has since shifted to 21 W. Superior St. *Editor*)

CLA follows the old Catholic tradition of "Wherever two are gathered in My Name, there is a magazine or newspaper." The group publishes a mimeographed monthly, *Grapevine*, for its 190 members and also an eight-page monthly tabloid called *Work* (circulation: 10,000).

It runs regular weekly labor classes at the Sheil School of Social Studies in downtown Chicago—and also (off and on) at three parishes outside the city. The classes include subjects like Public Speaking, Union Rights and Duties, History of Collective Bargaining, and Labor Legislation.

These two projects—publishing *Work* and running labor classes—are the two most tangible means the Alliance uses in carrying out its aim: trying to help build a Christian social order. By its nature, the Alliance is an educational organization—it isn't trying, for example, to form a Catholic labor union.

In its own quiet way, the Alliance is trying to promote justice in economic life. This day-to-day endeavor takes on some down-to-earth forms. Here are a few samples.

A high school student calls the office to say: "We got into a hot argument about labor in class today. The girls—even the teacher—don't like unions. Isn't there *something* good I could say about them?" In the next day's mail she gets a half-dozen pamphlets to reinforce her arguments.

A union member, kicked out of his union a few years ago when he committed a crime, wants help to appeal to his international executive board for reinstatement. An Alliance member gives him advice.

A local parish asks for a speaker

for its Sunday Holy Name breakfast. An Alliance member goes out and gives a talk on "The Church and Labor."

It is the last week in the month and the paper must be mailed. The chaplain, the editor and ten volunteers fold papers, lick stamps, tie bundles, and do other commonplace chores during the "folding party" lasting from 7 to 11 at night.

The Illinois legislature is considering a "fair employment" law banning racial and religious discrimination in hiring and firing. The Alliance sends a representative to a rally supporting the law.

ORIGINS

The Catholic Labor Alliance started its life in 1943—in the middle of the war, when most organizations were paralyzed, dying, or dead. On the feast of the Patronage of St. Joseph, March 19, of 1943, His Eminence Samuel Cardinal Stritch, Archbishop of Chicago, gave his approval and blessing to the launching of the new organization.

Significantly, it was to St. Joseph that Pope Pius XI entrusted the "vast campaign of the Church for that Christian justice which should reign in social life." The Alliance took St. Joseph, patron saint of workers, as its own patron.

In July of that year, Volume I, Number I of *Work*—"A Paper for All Who Work for a Living," as its

masthead still says—blossomed forth in four pages (it is now eight). The editor, Ed Marciniak, led a group of seminarians to the gates of a large Chicago factory, where they distributed 2,000 copies of the first issue. The reaction at the gates was varied: "Another Communist rag!" . . . "Work? Huh, I have enough of that all day." Others said nothing or else grunted a curt, "Not bad."

After the first issue the mail started pouring in at Three East. One trade unionist wrote grumpishly to Marciniak:

Where were you when things were tough (in organizing)? It's all right to jump on the labor bandwagon now, but we'd think more of you if you had been around . . . organizing the Chicago steel workers and the packing-house people back of the yards.

Marciniak was not stumped for an answer. He wrote back:

In 1938 when the big drive was on, I was riding in a police patrol wagon. Along with a few others, I was picked up for distributing union literature for the Packinghouse Workers Organizing Committee outside a stockyards entrance. If that was a bandwagon, I was on it.

Guided by Marciniak, *Work* has never been bashful about expressing itself on vital issues. From its own house-top, *Work* has cried that immediate steps be taken to provide medical care for the millions who now do not have it. To accomplish this, *Work* has called for the extension of private health insurance plans

such as Blue Cross—or (if those are not adequate) for the adoption of public health insurance.

An Alliance statement of aims, published in the first issue of *Work*, declared: "There is no hope for a mature social order until union membership becomes generally expected and accepted."

Sometimes the objection pops up: "Aren't you a little one-sided in going out so strong for labor?" To which Alliance members reply: "No, not any more than the Papal encyclicals, which contain statements that most Americans still call 'too radical' or 'soft Socialism.'"

FOR ALL GROUPS

Says John Loser, president of the Alliance:

We're for organization of *all* groups—employers, farmers, professional people, and workers. Doctors organize their medical societies. Farmers join their Grange organizations and other groups. Employers have their Chambers of Commerce. We're all for those. But we're also for the workers forming organizations of their own — unions. Lots of people omit this last part. The Popes didn't.

Through its program, the CLA aims to imbue its members with sound principles—so that the members can go out and put the principles into practice in their factories, offices, unions, homes, clubs and veterans' organizations.

Now largely composed of union members, the Alliance looks forward

to the day when management people too will join its ranks. A businessman was active in CLA for a while at the start, but he dropped out early. In this respect, the Alliance's history is not unusual: throughout the country groups that talk about rebuilding society get very little help from business representatives.

The gap is a serious one, and the Alliance has not yet found a way of filling it.

ABOUT COMMUNISM

Naturally, there are always some reasons that people can find to say, "I don't like *this* about your organization." What puzzles some people about the Alliance is that it doesn't beat its drums about the menace of Communism. It mentions that Communism is evil, yes—but always that present-day capital isn't the alternative to Communism. It stresses the Church's positive teaching on the dignity of every man, the worker's right to living wage, his right to join a union, his right to decent housing.

Work in a recent issue implied a "We-second-the-motion" when it printed the following quotation from Father Joseph Cardijn of Belgium, founder of the YCW movement:

Anti-Communism of the negative, stupid and shortsighted type has done a great deal of harm to the working class, the Church and the Faith. An anti-Communism of that kind creates the impression of being an anti-social

force directed against the workingman, and of preventing the reforms necessary for the salvation of the working class.

The greatest danger is not Communism, but ignorance of the truth. Communism is only one consequence of this ignorance. . . .

When the Communists attack injustice, want and inequalities, an anti-Communist attitude is not sufficient to put things right and to create order. . . .

We must know and preserve the dignity of life, the dignity of body and soul, of labor and family. We must work for a social order which allows that dignity to express itself in the conditions of everyday life.

Too many anti-Communists specialize in calling Communists nasty names and saying that they should be kicked out of labor unions. But today a growing number of Catholics realize that this negative anti-Communism must be replaced by a healthier positive approach.

A POSITIVE ATTITUDE

In February the Catholic Labor Alliance sponsored a talk on "Essentials of Social Order" by Bishop Francis J. Haas of Grand Rapids. About 700 persons heard Bishop Haas describe what makes up a good society. Of these, 200 stood all during the talk—there were no more seats. About 50 others were turned away at the door—the fire department said a fuller hall would be a fire hazard.

The turnout at the talk indicated

that Catholics were starting to take a more positive attitude toward social reform. Not once in his talk did Bishop Haas mention Communism or Communists.

Ten years ago such a huge turnout might have been possible—but only if Bishop Haas had turned his sights on Communism and kept them there.



Is the Dead Soldier a Martyr?

Well, he is not a martyr in the rigorous theological meaning of the word, inasmuch as he dies in arms, whereas the martyr delivers himself, undefended and unarmed, into the hands of the executioner. But if I am asked what I think of the eternal salvation of a brave man who has consciously given his life in defense of his country's honor, and in vindication of violated justice, I shall not hesitate to reply that, without any doubt whatever, Christ crowns his military valor; and that death accepted in this Christian spirit assures the safety of that man's soul. The soldier who dies to save his brothers, and to defend the hearths and altars of his country, reaches this highest of all degrees of charity. He may not have made a close analysis of the value of his sacrifice; but must we suppose that God requires of the plain soldier in the excitement of battle the methodical precision of the moralist or the theologian? Can we who revere his heroism doubt that his God welcomes him with love? Christian mothers, be proud of your sons. Of all griefs, of all human sorrows, yours is perhaps the most worthy of veneration. Suffer us to offer you not only our condolence but our congratulations. Not all our heroes obtain temporal honors, but for all we expect the immortal crown of the elect. For this is the virtue of a single act of perfect charity; it cancels a whole lifetime of sins. It transforms a sinful man into a saint.—*From a pastoral letter of Cardinal Mercier.*

Industrial Relations in the "Cold War"

BENJAMIN L. MASSE, S.J.

*Reprinted from COLUMBIA**

AMERICAN labor and management are on the spot today as they have never been before.

In the first place, they must produce the stuff needed to carry on the Korean war and to arm our projected three-million-man army, navy and air force. That means a minimum of work stoppages arising from industrial disputes.

In the second place, they must demonstrate to a skeptical world, a world confused by Communist propaganda, that free labor and free management can make collective bargaining work.

The first point scarcely needs elaboration. As modern wars are waged, the battle front extends right into the mines and factories which produce and fashion the planes, ships, tanks, guns and other equipment of a twentieth-century army. The line between the fighting and domestic fronts is not nearly so clear today as it used to be.

It may not be so obvious that the success or failure of collective bargaining, apart from its effect on production, has any special significance for the outcome of the "cold war" and the little wars which the Kremlin

seems bent on starting all over the world. Many of our people do not as yet seem to realize fully that the great struggle of our times, in which Soviet Russia and the United States stand forth as the chief protagonists, is unlike the power conflicts of the past. Though the cold war does, of course, have a power aspect, as the grim fighting in Korea shows, it is being conducted on an ideological level, too. The struggle is not taking place solely on the battlefield; it is also being fought in the hearts and minds of men. In the final analysis, it is a struggle between two ways of life, between two theories of man, between two philosophies of society. That is why no compromise is possible, any more than compromise was possible in the great war a thousand years ago between the Mohammedan East and the Christian West.

Where does collective bargaining fit into that picture?

It fits into the picture in this way.

Marxist Communism has a set of dogmas, and among them is the dogma of class warfare. Karl Marx, the founder of the Communist abomination, argued a century ago that in any industrial society based on pri-

* New Haven 7, Conn., December, 1950.

vate ownership of the means of production there was bound to be an irreconcilable conflict between those who owned property—the capitalists—and those who did not—the proletariat. By its very nature, capitalism exploited the proletariat. It could exist in no other way. Faced with this exploitation, workers had no choice except to war on their exploiters and destroy them. Collective bargaining, based on the possibility of a fair distribution of the fruits of production, was, therefore, a fraud and a delusion. According to the Bolshevik reading of Marx, the worker could be saved, could raise his standard of living, could break the chains which bound him, only by establishing, as a result of a bloody revolution, the dictatorship of the proletariat.

We know that dogma is false, but a large part of the rest of the world doesn't know it. That is why millions of underprivileged people, especially in Asia, but in Europe, too, continue to look with hope toward the grim, gray walls of the Kremlin. It is up to American labor and management, by deeds and not words, to show the world that Karl Marx was tragically wrong, that collective bargaining can work, that workers and employers are not irreconcilable enemies, but collaborators in the common effort of production, that free men can produce more and distribute it more fairly than all the dictatorships under

the sun, including the dictatorship of the proletariat. In so doing, U. S. labor and management will contribute enormously to winning the ideological war, which must be won if our country is to know security in this generation and the world is to have peace.

Will labor and management meet this challenge?

Sometimes one wonders.

TWO VIEWPOINTS

Back in the strike-studded days of 1946, many people said that collective bargaining had failed. Some of them are saying the same thing now, only with more emphasis.

They have two arguments.

In the first place they point to the breakdown of collective bargaining in critical sectors of the economy. They instance the steel strike last fall, the mess in coal, the paralyzing stoppage last year on the Missouri Pacific, the recent 100-day strike at Chrysler. The American economy, they argue, has become too complex and interdependent to permit these large-scale interruptions of business. There must be some cheaper, more efficient way of determining the content of the wage contract.

In the second place, the critics emphasize the complete inability of labor and management leaders to agree on the kind of law which should govern their relations. Management used the Republican victory

in the 1946 Congressional elections as justification for sponsoring the Taft-Hartley Act, which was totally unacceptable to labor. On the other hand, labor interpreted the Truman victory in November, 1948 as a mandate to write a labor law which is totally unacceptable to management. Anybody, say the critics of collective bargaining, who followed the hearings last year on several proposed substitutes for the Taft-Hartley Act must concede that between the stand of the National Association of Manufacturers and the U. S. Chamber of Commerce on the one hand, and that of the CIO and AFL on the other, there is an unbridgeable gulf.

All this means, they conclude, that, after nearly fifteen years of large-scale collective bargaining, labor and management are not much closer together than they were in the dog-eat-dog days before the Wagner Act.

Despite this indictment, collective bargaining still has supporters, of course, including such a veteran of labor-management wars as Cyrus Ching, head of the U. S. Conciliation Service. These men are willing to grant that bargaining did break down in critical sectors of the economy in 1946, and again last year, but they are not too dismayed by that. The nation, they point out, has just come through a shattering ordeal of war and post-war adjustment. All during the war labor and management worked under severe and unrelenting

tension. By the time the Japanese surrendered, the nerves of many a labor leader and industrialist were at the breaking point. Thousands of unresolved grievances added to the tensions. Both sides had come to depend too much on government for their own good. They had lost the knack of settling their own affairs. To all this add the enormous difficulty of making the transition from a wartime to a peacetime economy—with the government half in the picture and half out of it—and the rat-race these past four years between wages and prices. It would have been surprising if there had not been strikes during these unsettled times.

Furthermore, say the optimists, many leaders of labor and management, especially in the basic industries, have really had very little experience with collective bargaining. They're still learning. Give the boys a chance. And meanwhile, don't forget that it's the strike which makes the headlines, not the contract peacefully negotiated.

Which of these viewpoints is the correct one?

As in so many debates on public issues these days, it is likely that neither side is wholly right or wholly wrong. The pessimists certainly underestimate the progress in industrial relations over the past decade. Nobody can laugh off the thousands of contracts which labor and management negotiate every

year without slowdowns, or strikes, or lockouts, or newspaper headlines. Nobody can dismiss the growth in maturity of many labor leaders, or the earnest efforts in management circles to humanize personnel policies. All this represents achievement which can serve some day as the foundation for a solid structure of industrial relations.

On the other hand, there is no getting around the fact that some of the worst postwar strikes occurred in industries with a long history of collective bargaining. You cannot blame the printers' strikes in Chicago and elsewhere, or the various coal strikes, or the stoppages on the Missouri Pacific and on other railroads on the inexperience of labor and management with the process of collective bargaining. The unions and management involved in those disputes have been dealing with one another for years.

The pessimists have an argument, too, when they point a critical finger at the Taft-Hartley Act and the current drive to replace it. There was not the slightest evidence in the Washington hearings last year on the new labor bill that labor and management are ready to modify in any significant way the intransigent positions they took in 1947 when the Taft-Hartley Act was under consideration.

I think the disinterested observer must agree that the progress of industrial relations has not fulfilled public expectations. It is not the kind of

progress that we can hold up to the world as incontrovertible proof that collective bargaining in a private-enterprise economy can work and work well.

ROADBLOCKS TO INDUSTRIAL PEACE

There are any number of reasons for our failure to make collective bargaining work as the authors of the Wagner Act hoped that it would work. If I mention the four reasons which follow, it is not because experts in the field consider them the only obstacles to good labor-management relations, or even the most important ones. I mention them because in my experience they are significant roadblocks to industrial peace.

1. *The first obstacle is the conviction on the part of both management and labor that the other side is irresponsible.*

Employers frequently complain that unions are either unable or unwilling to make their members live up to the terms of the collective-bargaining agreement. They also charge that unions show a lack of understanding of the problems faced by employers. Workers seem to think that money grows on bushes, that competition is easy, that efficiency in production is a secondary consideration. Every year they want more and more for less and less. So say the employers.

For their part, unions feel that employers as a group have no real concern for the well-being of their em-

ployees. As an example of this, they instance the fatalistic approach of many employers to the boom-bust cycle, with its recurring periods of roaring prosperity and mass unemployment. If employers are really interested in their men, they ask, why is it that the big employer associations have opposed, as Charles Luckman has said, every piece of Federal legislation designed to better the lot of workers? Until employers reform their business lives, the unions see no hope of changing the frequently negative outlook of their members.

2. The second obstacle is a lack of mutual trust. Employers today are frankly concerned about what they call the ultimate objectives of organized labor. They suspect that the unions plan to encroach on management prerogatives, and these fears were not quieted when Walter Reuther demanded several years ago a "look at the books." Since collective bargaining is by its very nature a restriction on the freedom of the employer, at what point will it stop?

Unions are equally distrustful of the intentions of employers. Recalling the past, as they often do, labor leaders still fear for their survival. Those who were convinced back in the early forties that management had become reconciled to living with unions have again become skeptical since the passage of the Taft-Hartley Act. Now they believe that if the circumstances become propitious, many a manage-

ment will have another fling at smashing organized labor. This lack of trust, like the mutual charges of irresponsibility, is not conducive to constructive and peaceful relations.

3. The third obstacle to sound industrial relations is the conflict between the economic theories favored by labor and those approved by management. As things stand, labor and management tend to use economics not so much as a science as a means to rationalize their respective interests. Management tends to justify large profits because it thinks in terms of capital expenditures and attractive investments. Labor tends to emphasize wages because it thinks in terms of consumer buying power and the immediate relationship between a man's pay envelope and his standard of living. As a result of these prepossessions, neither party approaches the collective-bargaining table in an objective mood. The facts of economics are really less influential in determining their policies than are their appraisals of their respective powers. Too often, might makes right in collective bargaining.

4. Finally, both labor and management manifest a growing tendency to transfer their struggle from the economic to the political sphere. Why bother to reach agreement through collective bargaining when one or the other party figures that it can bring government into the dispute on its side of the table? If this trend is not

reversed, it will lead to the formation of political parties on class lines. Labor and management will subordinate the hard work of collective bargaining to the exciting struggle for control of the government. That way lies disaster for industrial relations—and for democracy as well.

WILLINGNESS TO COLLABORATE

Now none of these obstacles is insuperable. In thousands of cases unions act responsibly and are willing to collaborate with fair-minded managements. In thousands of cases, too, employers have abandoned any idea of destroying trade unionism and are prepared to live with it. In growing numbers, they are also becoming concerned about the boom-bust cycle and are studying methods of maintaining production and employment at high levels. So long as employers and workers remain human beings, they will tend to see economic facts through different spectacles. After all, their *immediate* interests are frequently in conflict. The greater the share of industrial income that goes to workers in the form of wages, the smaller will be the share that goes to stockholders

in the form of dividends. Nevertheless, there are signs that both sides are developing a new respect for economic science and are more willing than was formerly the case to consult expert opinion. There is even a growing realization that though the immediate interests of labor and management may conflict, their long-range goals coincide. In the final analysis they both want an expanding, profitable enterprise.

So far as the emphasis on politics goes, it is not yet too late to reverse the trend. If the first three obstacles could be overcome, both labor and management would largely forget the power struggle in Washington, and concentrate on making government intervention in their affairs increasingly unnecessary.

Are there enough men in labor and management with the wisdom and courage to surmount these and other obstacles to good industrial relations and prove to Marxist skeptics that collective bargaining can work?

It is no exaggeration to say that the future of the world depends in a significant way on the answer to that question.



Mother Love

Mother's voice is the most consoling and most beautiful voice the child will ever hear. But happy is that child whose mother is not an opera singer! The voice that heals, the voice that soothes, the voice that makes the child feel that he is wanted, comes from the mother's heart and does not require professional training.—*Calvin T. Ryan in the CATHOLIC HOME MESSENGER, January, 1951.*

Editorials

Dissenters Unite

WITH only a few dissenting voices last week the Federal Council of Churches with some other groups went out of existence to make way for a new National Council of Churches of Christ in the U. S. A. The new Council represented four Orthodox communions and twenty-five Protestant sects with a total membership of something over 30,000,000 Christians. It has been generally hailed as one of the most significant advances made in American Protestant church circles in this century. The purpose of the new organization, which replaced eight existing Protestant agencies, is to provide a more vital and unified voice for American Protestants in pronouncements of moral significance.

Some have mistaken this latest step as meaning that we are witnessing the first steps toward the establishment of a national church in the United States and that prospects are bright for the future. The facts do not allow so sanguine an interpretation. There are two large Protestant denominations which have expressed their unwillingness to be part of the new National Council and most of the 256 Protestant sects (generally small) do not belong. For all that,

the National Council represents more than two-thirds of American Protestants. It is important, then, to understand correctly along what lines this new effort at unity has been accomplished.

There has been no attempt to arrive at anything like theological unity in the National Council in spite of many hopes expressed in that direction. The Council represents an *organizational* advance merely and a *coordinating center* for mutual denominational assistance. The "unity" which has been so much emphasized is best understood, then, as an opportunity for more convenient cooperation—which is something less than the usual meaning of the word unity.

In the light of this we cannot take seriously the warning which one of the Council's Protestant opponents made last week on the formation of that organization. He referred to it as "another mile-post on the way to a super-church" and a "whistle-stop on the train back to Rome." Anyone who understands anything at all about the roads that lead to Rome will know that they are only travelled by those who seek that doctrinal unity which is found in the traditional teachings of Jesus Christ. Organizational cooperation may render more

effective the present efforts of American Protestantism but it surely will not bring any closer the unity of Christendom which was shattered by the defections of four hundred years ago. Anyone who tries to read anything more than this into the recent events in Cleveland is headed for disillusionment or worse.

For our part we recognize in the continued efforts for Christian unity a spirit which should be encouraged on every possible occasion. It is a strong and incessant urging which is continually felt among the non-Catholic communions; it is in fact the mood of those who yearn for their Father's house, for the Church which they have abandoned. We should remember, too, that there is no other lodging which can truly be called home. — *THE PILOT, Boston, Mass.*, Dec. 9, 1950.

Liberating Tibet

NOW, Tibet is to be liberated by the thoughtful red Chinese. To the Communists in China, Tibet is hateful because it is ruled by religion. For centuries it has been a quiet, orderly country, administered jointly by civil and religious authorities. Its only grief has been brought by outsiders. That it is resourceful and valuable as a possession, of course, does not motivate its invaders. They are merely idealistic soldiers determined to liberate everybody into enslavement.

What the Chinese plan doing to Tibet, a country founded on religion, is what the Kremlin would like to do to the Catholic Church.

Tibet, which seems to be a mystery to the average person, is a theocratic state. The church and the state are one. Public office is held jointly by two men in each government job—a lay office-holder and a Tibetan monk. The country is headed by the Dalai Lama. He has the status of a god by reincarnation. In fact when he dies a child is sought who was born at exactly the minute of the Lama's death. That child becomes the Lama, presumably housing the soul of the deceased. A regency rules until he reaches the age of 18. The present Dalai Lama is only 17, and will not take the throne until next year. Before 1924, there were several Lamas who aspired to power. They were called Panchen Lamas. For centuries there had been rivalry between the Lashi (Panchen) Lamas and the Dalai Lamas, the latter invariably winning out through the devotion of the masses. The last Panchen was driven out by the predecessor of the present Dalai Lama. He died in China in 1937, but the red Communist rulers in China claim to have found a boy who inherited the exile's soul. He is a 12-year-old Tibetan, and he is a radio character who pleads with the Chinese reds to "liberate" his country. That is the thin excuse for the present invasion.

Last August, the Dalai regent declared a religious war against Communism and evicted Communist sympathizers from the Tibetan lamasaries. He sent out 3,000 student monks to rally a spiritual front against the red propagandists. More recently he requested aid from India.

It is not generally known, but the regency also has sent several appeals to the United States for assistance in beating off Communism.

The Chinese Reds know that if they can effect, by force, religious changes in Tibet, they can uproot all that has been accomplished throughout Tibet's history.—*CATHOLIC REVIEW, Baltimore, Md.*, Nov. 3, 1950.

These "Democratic" Rights

ALL too frequently today persons in positions of influence and authority refer, in speech and writing, to "the democratic rights of men." It is a phrase commonly used to describe what the people behind the Iron Curtain and the poor serfs of the Soviet have lost. What is actually meant is the God-given rights of man. This is no small matter. It is of elemental importance if one is really concerned with the establishment of a just and lasting peace. If the misstatement is made deliberately, with a tinge of malice, it is a form of sabotage—so far as real peace is concerned. If the misstate-

ment is made through ignorance, as it frequently is, it brings one to the discouraging realization of the enormous work that lies ahead to restore the human being to his rightful dignity.

If one says a man is free to do this or that, because it is one of his "democratic rights," the individual is left in a precarious position. He has no rights as an individual. He has these rights because he lives in a democracy. If he does not live in a democracy, he might not be considered as having these rights. Then, too, it seems that today we have all sorts of democracies. Some countries which pass as democracies do not give all the rights, or the same rights, as do some other countries that are called democracies. And yet, we hear very little public debate as to whether such "rights" should be granted in the former democracy because they are allowed in the latter, or that they should not be allowed in the latter because they are not countenanced in the former. It is all very relative, and in time one could come to regard a human being in one country as being less as a personality than a human being in another country.

The appalling possibilities of this confusion become clearer when one sees the—only occasionally now, it is true—reference to Soviet Russia as "one of the democracies." Of course, the main objection to speaking of

"the democratic rights" of man is that these are not rights conferred by a democracy or enjoyed only because one is a citizen of a democracy. There are certain rights which a man has because he is a human being. They derive from God. They are rights which a State cannot confer or take away. A State may prevent a man from exercising his God-given rights, but the man still has his rights. It may be asked: what good does it do to argue about whether the rights a man has are God-given or State-given, if the State can prevent his exercising them in any event?

The answer is, of course, that it makes a great deal of difference. A State may prevent men from enjoying their God-given rights, but it cannot take those rights away. If the State had conferred these rights, it could take them away, and men

would have no right to them at all, or ever again. One's neighbor may temporarily prevent one from entering into a house which one owns, but the house is the individual's. If the neighbor has loaned one the house, and decided to prevent one's entering it any more, the individual has neither the right nor the hope of living in that house again. Many men speak of "the democratic rights of man" because they do not know God, and therefore cannot conceive of the God-given rights of man. This mistake is made honestly, but it is nonetheless dangerous. To deny that man has certain inalienable rights because he is a human being, and to say he has these rights only because his government confers them upon him, is to start on the path to totalitarianism.—THE RECORD, Perth, Australia, Sept. 14, 1950.



Respect for Others

Reverence is not something we owe only to those who are closest to us. It should be part of our attitude toward everyone, quite aside from whether we like or dislike him. Just as reverence prohibits using those we like solely for our own pleasure, it rises above mere "politeness" or "tolerance" of those we dislike. Politeness and tolerance are not reverence—they are merely the secular remnants of a profoundly Christian tradition, all that remain to us as substitutes for the love we should bear toward every individual because he carries within him the reflection of Christ—no matter how obscured it may be by his own sins or by our lack of charity.—From TODAY, December, 1950.

Documentation

Mirabile Illud

HIS HOLINESS, POPE PIUS XII

Authorized English text of the Encyclical dated December 6, 1950.

**TO OUR VENERABLE BRETHREN THE PATRIARCHS, PRIMATES,
ARCHBISHOPS, BISHOPS AND OTHER LOCAL ORDINARIES
HAVING PEACE AND COMMUNION WITH THE APOSTOLIC SEE**

VENERABLE Brethren, health and apostolic blessing. That admirable prodigy of fraternal concord which the numberless multitudes of the faithful, from almost every nation, flocking to Rome as devout pilgrims during the course of the Holy Year have provided seems to us to contain as it were a warning voice, a solemn testimony to everybody that the peoples of the world do not wish for war nor discord nor hatred, but ardently desire peace, unity of minds and that Christian love which alone can be the source of a better and more happy era for all. It is our ardent wish that all should at last hear that warning, as with anxious mind We behold peoples engaged in a fearful preparation for war while in certain places a horrible fury of slaughter is already reaping its harvest of courageous, youthful lives.

Is it not abundantly clear that bloody conflicts bring in their wake untold ruins, slaughter and misery of every kind? So terrible are the mechanical equipment and instruments of modern warfare invented by the genius of man—genius which indeed was created for other purposes—that they must inspire any thinking person with profound horror, especially as they oftentimes strike not merely armies but also civilians and even innocent children, women, the aged and infirm, and likewise sacred buildings and most outstanding artistic achievements.

Who is there who is not stricken with horror at the thought of possible addition of other cemeteries to the innumerable graveyards of the recent war; likewise, that to the still crumbling walls of so many cities and towns still further ruins may be added? Who is there, in fine, who does not tremble at the prospect of economic difficulties which so greatly affect almost all peoples, and in particular those of the poorer classes, being aggravated still more by the further loss of wealth which is a necessary concomitant of war.

We who raise our mind above the flood of human desires, We who cherish fatherly affection for the peoples of all nations and races and desire to preserve intact the peace of all and to daily advance their prosperity, We, Venerable Brethren, whenever We see the brightness of the

heavens overcast with lowering clouds and new dangers of wars threaten mankind. We cannot help raising our voice and exhorting all to put aside animosities, to compose differences and to introduce that true peace which, as it behooves, will publicly and sincerely recognize and safeguard the rights of religion and peoples and of individual citizens.

Nevertheless we well know that human efforts are incapable of achieving such result. It is necessary first of all to renew the hearts of men, to repress covetousness and greed, to allay hatreds, to really put into practice the norms and dealings of justice, to bring about a better distribution of wealth, to foster mutual charity and to stir up virtue in all.

There is nothing which can conduce more effectively and contribute more to the attainment of this great objective than the Christian religion; for its divine precepts teach us that men, as brothers, form one family whose Father is God, of which Christ is the Redeemer and by His heavenly grace the nourisher, and whose lasting homeland is Heaven.

If these precepts were really and duly put into effect, then without any doubt no wars, sedition, strife or suppression of civil or religious liberty would disturb public and private life, but a peaceful stability, founded on right order and justice, would possess the minds and souls of men and would open up a safe path to the attainment of a daily growing measure of prosperity.

This is indeed a difficult but necessary task. And if necessary it can brook no delay, but should be put into effect as soon as possible. If it is difficult and beyond human capacity, then we must have recourse in prayer and supplication to the heavenly Father, as down through the centuries in times of crisis our forefathers have done with happy and salutary results.

APPEALS FOR PRAYERS

Wherefore We strongly urge and exhort you, Venerable Brethren, to arrange for public supplications and to invite your flocks to implore peace and concord for peoples; so that under the patronage of religion there may be a sacred struggle, as it were, to offset that abominable strife which threatens the whole human family with so many dangers.

You are undoubtedly aware that We shall celebrate the Eucharistic sacrifice at the hour of midnight that marks the beginning of the feast of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary, and that our suppliant voice by means of radio communication may be heard by all. We wish, moreover, that especially on that holy night all the faithful, united with the Vicar of Jesus Christ, should invoke from the Father of Mercies through the intercession of the most powerful patronage of the Virgin Mother of God, preserved from every stain of Original Sin, that at long last, with hatreds put to rest and all differences justly and equitably settled, the light of real and genuine peace may radiate to all nations and peoples.

And We further desire that with the same spiritual ardor for this cause prayers be repeatedly offered during the novena of supplication customarily held in preparation for the solemn feast of the Birth of Jesus Christ, to

beseech the Divine Infant that the peace proclaimed above His sacred crib by angelic choirs to men of good will [Luke 2, 14] may shine forth throughout the world and become firmly established everywhere.

Nor should there be omitted earnest prayers of supplication to the new-born Redeemer through His Blessed Mother that the Catholic religion, which is the most secure foundation of human society and civilized culture, may enjoy due liberty in all nations and that those "who suffer persecution for justice' sake" [Matt. 5, 10], those who because of their courageous defense of the rights of the Holy Church are confined to prison, or are driven forth and banished from their homes, and those also who, exiled from their fatherlands, wander about in wretchedness or still languish in captivity, may receive heavenly consolations and be granted at length that good fortune which they have been awaiting with such burning desire and ardent longing.

We do not doubt, Venerable Brethren, that with your usual pastoral care and diligence you will communicate this, our paternal exhortation, to your clergy and faithful in the way you deem most suitable; and We likewise feel certain that all our dearly beloved children in Christ throughout the world will gladly and willingly correspond to this present invitation.

Meanwhile, may the apostolic blessing which, lovingly in the Lord, We impart as a pledge of our paternal benevolence be to each and all of you, Venerable Brethren, to all your fellow citizens, and to those in particular who pour forth suppliant prayers in accordance with our intentions, a source of heavenly graces.

Given at Rome from St. Peter's on the sixth day of December, the year 1950, the twelfth of Our Pontificate.

Pius PP. XII.

The Child: Citizen of Two Worlds

Statement issued by the Catholic Bishops of the United States at the close of their annual meeting, Washington, D. C., November 15-17, 1950.

INTRODUCTION

IN the present grim international struggle, the American people have resolutely championed the cause of human freedom. We have committed ourselves to oppose relentlessly the aggressions of those who deny to man his God-given rights and who aim to enslave all mankind under the rule of Godless materialism. The responsibilities which we have thereby assumed are both grave and continuing. They deserve conscientious consideration.

It is of primary importance for our people to realize that human freedom derives from the spiritual nature of man and can flourish only when the things of the spirit are held in reverence. Our present principles of action need to be evaluated in the light of that truth. But we must go even further. Small comfort to be successful today if tomorrow the world finds us un-

worthy of the trust reposed in us. We need, therefore, to examine carefully what spiritual direction we are giving to our children to prepare them to fulfill their future moral responsibilities to God and to their fellow man.

In recent decades, striking advances have been made in meeting the child's physical, emotional and social needs; but his moral and religious needs have not been met with the same solicitude and understanding. As a result, many of our children today betray confusion and insecurity because these un-met needs are fundamental to the harmonious development of their whole nature.

The child must be seen whole and entire. He must be seen as a citizen of two worlds. He belongs to this world surely, but his first and highest allegiance is to the Kingdom of God. From his earliest years he must be taught that his chief significance comes from the fact that he is created by God and is destined for life with God in Eternity.

The child's prospects for fulfilling this great hope which God has reposed in him must be viewed realistically. He will come to maturity in a society where social, moral, intellectual and spiritual values are everywhere disintegrating. In such a society, he will urgently need the integrating force of religion as taught by Christ. Such a force will give him a complete and rational meaning for his existence.

First of all, it will arouse in him a consciousness of God and of eternity. His vision will be opened out upon a supernatural world revealed by faith which differs from the world of nature his senses reveal. Thus he will discover a higher life than this daily one and a brighter world than that he sees. Secondly, it will give him a continuing purpose in life, for it will teach him that he was made to know, love and serve God in this world as the condition for meriting eternal happiness. Thirdly, it will induce in him a deep sense of responsibility for those rights and obligations he possesses by reason of his citizenship in heaven as well as on earth. Finally, religion will challenge him to sanctify whatever walk of life he chooses and to seek and accept the Will of God in whatever way it may be manifested. Thus, as a principle of integration, religion will help the child to develop a *sense of God*, a *sense of direction*, a *sense of responsibility* and a *sense of mission* in this life.

I. SENSE OF GOD

The child is not complete in himself. He will find his completion only in life with God; and that life must begin here upon earth. Parents therefore should make early provision for their child's growth in God. This is not something to be postponed for nurture by school authorities. It must begin in the home through simple and prayerful practices. Morning and evening prayers, grace before and after meals, the family rosary, the saying of a short prayer each time the striking clock marks the passage of another hour nearer eternity, the reverential making of the Sign of the Cross, the inculcation of respect for the Crucifix and other religious objects—all these are practices which should be encouraged in the religious

formation of the child. No one can doubt that there is a readiness on his part to receive such formation, and if parents are remiss in giving it, they will lose a splendid opportunity to develop in their child that habitual awareness of God which is vital to his full growth.

Only two courses are open to the child—either he will be God-centered or self-centered. He is made and destined for God, but he bears in his nature the lingering effects of original sin, which incline him to seek the satisfaction of every selfish whim. To correct this bent in his will so that God, rather than self, will occupy the center of his life is one of the most challenging tasks facing parents.

IMITATION OF CHRIST

In meeting this challenge, let parents make use of the strong supernatural motivation which can be drawn from the life of Christ. Let them encourage the imitation of Him, particularly in His obedience, patience and thoughtfulness of others; and let them foster the emulation of that spirit of unselfish giving so characteristic of Christ. This can be done in many practical ways, particularly through providing the child with frequent opportunities for making acts of self-denial in the home. If he is taught to deny his selfish whims for the sake of Christ, he will not only discover a supernatural motive for his actions, but he will learn to give God that central place in his affections which God must occupy if the child is to come to his full spiritual stature.

Little point would be served in intensifying the child's awareness of God during his pre-school years, if later his schooling were to rob him of that. His education during school years should be of a piece with his education at home. Catholic parents, clearly grasping this essential truth, have undergone great sacrifice and enormous expense to establish and maintain schools which will continue and enlarge the spiritual development of the child that was begun at home. In doing this, parents have acted within their competence, because it is they, and not the State, who possess the primary right to educate.

This natural right of parents is one which has ever been recognized in our American tradition. As recently as 1944, the highest court in our land confirmed it in these words: "It is cardinal with us that the custody, care and nurture of the child *reside first in the parents* whose primary function and freedom include preparation for obligations the State can neither supply nor hinder."

In helping parents to exercise this right, the Church stands ready at hand with all her material and spiritual resources. At infancy she initiates the child into the life of grace and for the rest of his days she stands by his side ready to minister to his needs. She recognizes his pre-eminent need for God and she meets it by providing Catholic schools for each stage of his educational development. She does this in virtue of the sublime teaching office conferred upon her by Jesus Christ.

When it is impossible for parents to take advantage of the God-centered

education which Catholic schools offer, they have a grave obligation to provide for their child's religious instruction in some other way. At least they must see that their children attend Catechism classes and vacation schools and receive the benefit of other activities of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine.

RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION

Nor should the State, which has demonstrated a genuine interest in so many aspects of the child's welfare, be indifferent to the inherent value of religious instruction and training for the child attending tax-supported schools. The continuance and well-being of a State based on democratic principles require that it show a lively concern for moral principles and practices which are firmly grounded only in religion. For the child who is not receiving thorough religious education, the State should look with favor on released-time programs for his religious instruction.

Many important services have been rendered by governmental agencies to the child who has been deprived of the care and support of his parents by death, illness or misfortune. However, it is a source of growing concern to us that in certain parts of our country there is a trend to regard this whole field of foster care as falling within the exclusive province of governmental authorities. It surely lies within their province to set up and enforce legitimate minimum standards of care for the dependent child; but the responsibility for his care should not be entirely assumed by them. There is a definite place in America for the voluntary agencies of mercy—particularly those operating under religious auspices, which are equipped to safeguard and develop the religious life of the dependent child. Certainly the child bereft of the immediate care of his parents is entitled to those opportunities for a religious upbringing which his parents were obligated to give him. These opportunities can be best supplied by an agency operating under religious auspices.

II. SENSE OF DIRECTION

The child whose eyes have been opened to the vision of God must be encouraged to walk by the steady light of that vision; otherwise he will follow wandering fires. He is too young and immature to be left to himself. His impulses and desires, so largely unregulated because of his tender years, need to be given a sure direction by religious training, if he is to achieve that great purpose for which he was made: to know, to love and to serve God.

The child must *know* God. There is a vast difference between "knowing about God" and "knowing God." The difference is made by personal experience. It is not enough that the child be given the necessary truths about God. They ought to be given in such a way that he will assimilate them and make them a part of himself. God must become as real to him as his own father or mother. God must not remain an abstraction. If

he does, He will not be loved; and if He is not loved, then all the child's knowledge about Him will be sterile. Where love is, there too is service. "If you love Me, keep My commandments." That is Christ's test and it must be applied to the child. He should be brought to see God's commandments and precepts as guide-posts which give an unerring direction to his steps. In this work, the Church, the family and the school all have a part to play.

From the time that the Church pours the waters of Baptism over his forehead, until she surrenders him at death to God, there is no period when she does not provide the child, through her sacraments and teachings, with a steady inspiration to serve God. The inculcation of virtues, both natural and supernatural, the repeated warnings against succumbing to the demands of his lower nature, the balm with which she alleviates the wounds caused by sin in his life, and the channels of grace she holds constantly open for him—all these are aides which the Church gives the child in directing his steps towards God.

GOOD EXAMPLE IN THE HOME

Parents are obligated to see that he makes ample use of these helps; and in addition they must inspire him to love and service of God by their own daily actions. The home will be his first school. He will be quick to imitate what he sees and hears there. Let them turn this impulse to imitate, which can be the source of much mischief and lasting harm, to the child's advantage by giving him at home a good example of Christian living.

If this example is not forthcoming, the child will become confused by the contradiction between what he is taught and what he sees practiced. This confusion will be compounded when he goes to a school where religion is taught. There he will be taught to reverence the name of God, but at home he will hear God's name used irreverently in petulance and anger. At school he will learn to cooperate and get along with his fellow-pupils, but at home he will be allowed to offend and wrangle with his brothers and sisters. At school he will be taught strict precepts of honesty and justice, while at home he will hear his parents boast of sharp business practices and clever evasions of the truth. Disturbed by these contradictions and torn by conflicting loyalties to home and school, the child will lose confidence in his parents' and teachers' powers to give him effective direction.

A close association between home and school should be maintained by parents and school authorities so as to facilitate an exchange of views and confidences regarding the child. In this way, home and school life can be better integrated and there will be a reduction of those conflicts which very often are at work in his life, and which do not receive the understanding and attention they deserve.

When we speak of parents' responsibilities, it should be remembered that they do not devolve entirely upon the mother. The father has his

responsibilities, too, and he must not shirk them. It is not enough for him to provide the material means of support for the family. He also has the obligation to identify himself with the interests and activities of his child. If the full benefits of parental direction are to be reaped by the child, such direction should include that steady and stabilizing influence which it is the father's duty to exert.

Fathers and mothers have a natural competence to instruct their children with regard to sex. False modesty should not deter them from doing their duty in this regard. Sex is one of God's endowments. It should not be ignored or treated as something bad. If sex instruction is properly carried on in the home, a deep reverence will be developed in the child and he will be spared the shameful inferences which he often makes when he is left to himself to find out about sex. We protest in the strongest possible terms against the introduction of sex instruction into the schools. To be of benefit such instruction must be far broader than the imparting of information, and must be given individually. Sex is more than a biological function. It is bound up with the sacredness and uniqueness of the human personality. It can be fully and properly appreciated only within a religious and moral context. If treated otherwise, the child will see it apart from the controlling purpose of his life, which is service to God.

Many unsalutary influences are at work in modern society which must not be allowed free play upon the personality of the growing child. Parents should carefully regulate the company and the hours which their child keeps. They should not treat him as an adult. He needs to be warned against, even forbidden, certain associations. Particularly during adolescence, this is extremely important. A vigilant watch should be kept over the type of entertainment in which he indulges, the motion pictures he attends, the books he reads, the radio and television programs to which he is exposed in the home.

III. SENSE OF RESPONSIBILITY

A common complaint registered against the home and the school today is that they do not sharpen the child's sense of responsibility. He is made conscious of his rights, to be sure; but he also has obligations which are correlates of those rights. His education and training are defective in the proportion that those obligations are not impressed on his young mind.

No point is urged with greater insistence by religion than the accountability of each individual before God. It is the duty of parents to see to it that their child develops a deep sense of personal responsibility; learning at the earliest possible period that he is accountable to God for his thoughts, his words and his actions. His home training must reinforce this teaching in every practical way. He should be held to strict account for the performance of chores and tasks which are given to him by his parents. He must be made to see that each member of the family has a part to play in the service of God by carrying out an assigned role. The child, thus enlightened, will be enabled to see in later life how the faithful

discharge of his duties as a citizen can be related to the service of God.

Part of the boredom affecting our society today is due to the unsound separation which has developed between work and spiritual growth. The concept of work as a means of furthering sanctification has largely been lost. It remains for parents to recover that concept and apply it to the child's daily experience. From the consciousness that even the smallest household task when faithfully carried out draws him closer to God, the child will derive a continuing motivation for relating all that he does to God. And thus every task, no matter how trivial or menial, can take on a significance which will yield rich spiritual returns.

In this way the child will have learned at home a great lesson which will make it easier for him to adjust to the demands of school life. As he takes his place in that larger community, he will do so as a responsible individual. He will see his homework, his attention in class and his participation in school activities as part of the same divine plan learned in the home, whereby each action has its significance in God's eyes. This mindfulness throughout his daily life of the supernatural value of his actions will be a safeguard against the careless performance of any duty. The greater his talent, the more he will be conscious of his obligation to serve God by a rightful exercise of that talent.

If the child is constantly aware that his time and his talents belong to God, he will want to use them properly and will avoid those harmful associations and pastimes which frequently lead to juvenile delinquency. This implies, however, that adequate recreational facilities and opportunities for the development of his interest in hobbies, games and other activities are available, so that his abounding energy can find wholesome channels for expression.

The spiritual helps which the child has for deepening his sense of responsibility must not be neglected. Parents should encourage the practice of nightly examination of conscience and weekly confession. The child who goes over his thoughts, speech and actions at the end of each day, seeking out what has been displeasing to God, will gradually develop a sensitivity to God's claims upon his life. The practice of weekly confession will make him conscious of the manner in which he has misused his time and talents. It will heighten in him that sense of accountability to God which is necessary if he is to show proper contrition for his failings and proper amendment of them.

IV. SENSE OF MISSION

In learning the valuable lesson that he is accountable to God for the use of his time and talents, the child will acquire not only a sense of responsibility, but a sense of mission as well. For his religious training will remind him that his future happiness lies not in the indulgence of selfish desires, but in the complete dedication of his whole personality to God's service. "I am come to do the will of Him who sent me." This must be the keynote of the child's mission in this world. For him the

Will of God must come to be more important than any personal consideration. Only when he masters this truth will he be given to see how all things, even disappointments and setbacks, can be turned to good account in the service of God.

Since everyone is not called to serve God in the same way or in the same capacity, great care should be exercised in the child's vocational guidance. Otherwise, aimlessness in his training will leave him without permanent direction for his talents and aptitudes. Parents and teachers must help him to choose and to follow a calling for which he is fitted and in which he can best serve God. A deeper awareness in the child of his mission in life will do much to reduce the shocking waste of time and energy which in so many instances characterizes his formative years today, and later prevents him from taking his full place in civic life.

Among the boys and girls of our land, God has destined some to carry on the work of His Church for the salvation of souls. To these He has given a religious vocation. Here indeed is a challenge to the generosity of American parents. If in all sincerity they have impressed upon their child that he has a mission in life to do God's Will, they, in turn, will want to cooperate with that Will and aid in its fulfillment. God's claims are prior to every human consideration. If He calls the child to His special service, parents should not shrink from the sacrifice often entailed by such a call. The pain of severing home ties will be more than offset by the spiritual joy given to those who labor in the Vineyard of the Lord.

In emphasizing the supreme importance of religion in the spiritual development of the child, we are but applying to the circumstances of today the eternal principles which the Church received from her Divine Founder. For nineteen centuries, the Church has lingered lovingly over Christ's tribute to the child: "Suffer little children to come unto Me and forbid them not; for of such is the kingdom of God." The implications of that tribute should be recognized by all who have care of the child. Theirs is the great vocation to show him that he is a citizen, not only of the world, but of that other world which lies beyond with God, Whose kingdom is the kingdom of children.

THE CATHOLIC MIND

EDITOR: Robert C. Hartnett

EXECUTIVE EDITOR: Benjamin L. Masse

With the collaboration of the *AMERICA* staff

EDITORIAL OFFICE: 329 West 108th St., New York 25, N. Y.

BUSINESS MANAGER: Joseph C. Mulhern

BUSINESS OFFICE: 70 East 45th St., New York 17, N. Y.